

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. For the present the QUARTERLY will be published in two DOUBLE numbers in April and October; the times of publication of the REVIEW are variable under prevailing conditions.

The Classical Review

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN

NOV 9 1950

PERIODICAL READING ROOM

Editors { C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3 The University, Glasgow, W. 2
R. M. RATTENBURY, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge

ALL COMMUNICATIONS intended for the Editors should be sent to MR. FORDYCE. BOOKS for review should be sent to the Publisher

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT

PROF. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. (Chairman)	} Representing the Council of the Classical Association
PROF. R. G. AUSTIN, M.A. (Hon. Treas.)	
F. H. SANDBAGE, M.A.	
PROF. F. W. WALBANK, M.A.	
W. S. WATT, M.A. (Hon. Sec.)	
N. G. L. HAMMOND, M.A., representing the Cambridge Philological Society	
M. PLATNAUER, B.Lit., M.A., representing the Oxford Philological Society	

With the co-operation of

PROF. B. D. MERITT, *Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton*, PROF. J. A. FITZHERBERT, *University of Adelaide*, and
PROF. HOMER A. THOMPSON, *University of Toronto*

Volume LXIV

SEPTEMBER 1950

Number 2

CONTENTS

NOTES AND NEWS	41
IMMORTALITY IN PLATO'S <i>SYMPOSIUM</i> . R. HACKFORTH	43
DEMOSTHENES iv. 21. J. H. KELLs	46
JULIAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF LATIN. E. A. THOMPSON	51
AN EMENDATION IN SAPPHO. H. J. M. MILNE	53
MARTIAL ii. 14. 14-18. GERTRUDE HIRST	53
REVIEWS:	
<i>Textual Criticism of the Odyssey</i> (van der Valk), J. A. DAVISON, 54; <i>Römische Satiren</i> (Weinreich), R. BROWNING, 55; <i>Quinte-Curce</i> (Bardon), G. C. WHITTICK, 56; <i>St. Jérôme, Lettres, I</i> (Labourt), R. BROWNING, 58; <i>Les lettres grecques en l'occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore</i> (Courcelle), G. W. H. LAMPE, 59; <i>The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History</i> (Cary), G. E. F. CHILVER, 61; <i>The Athenian Tribute Lists, II</i> (Meritt, Wade-Gery, and McGregor), R. MEIGGS, 63; <i>La Vie internationale dans la Grèce des Clés</i> (Martin), N. G. L. HAMMOND, 65; <i>Alexanders Reichsmünzen</i> (Kleiner), C. T. SELTMAN, 66; <i>Traité de phonétique grecque</i> (Lejeune), L. R. PALMER, 68; <i>Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits grecs</i> (Richard), D. C. C. YOUNG, 70; <i>Some Oxford Compositions</i> , R. G. AUSTIN, 71.	
SHORT REVIEWS	72
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	78
BOOKS RECEIVED	79

OXFORD : AT THE CLARENDON PRESS

LONDON, NEW YORK, TORONTO, AND MELBOURNE : GEOFFREY CUMBERLEGE

Price 5s. net. Yearly subscription, 16s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$2.30. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 30s. net, post free; U.S.A., \$4.30

Entered as Second Class at the New York, U.S.A., Post Office.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £5. 5s.). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association. They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 13s. 6d., *Quarterly* 15s.; combined subscription £1. 5s. 6d.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 10s. 6d.

Copies of the final issue of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (covering the years 1945-47) can still be obtained from Messrs. J. W. Arrowsmith, Quay Street, Bristol, for 10s. (for members of the Association, 6s.), and the volume for 1939-45 for 6s. from Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, who can also supply most of the pre-war back numbers at 2s. 6d. per volume, post free.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Mr. J. S. Shields, Queen Mary's School, Basingstoke, Hants. Inquiries should be sent to either of the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor L. J. D. Richardson, University College, Cardiff, and Mr. T. W. Melliush, Bec School, London, S.W. 17) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz. Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, East Anglia, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Shrewsbury, Southampton, South-Western, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

n
n
;
l
s

l
l
/
n
s
n

s
r
n
t

.
f
/
.
.
.
.
.
l

T

A c
Bri
167

the
seen
Gen
15
tive
larg
arr
Ma
wit
Un
Ph
rec
Ass
Ser
Bri
to
gui
Mr
Ki
we
Na
wh
by
in
th
vie
Pa
br
be

Pr
to
m
m
Gi
O
E
m
A
D
C
B

THE CLASSICAL REVIEW

SEPTEMBER 1950

NOTES AND NEWS

A CORRESPONDENT writes: 'The city of Bristol was described by J. Millerd in 1671 as

urbs haec sublimis spatiosa fidelis amoena
dulcis et insignis prisca benigna nitens:

the truth of the description was well seen by the Classical Association at its General Meeting held there from 12 to 15 April. The programme was attractive, and attendance was particularly large; members were delighted with the arrangements made for their comfort in Manor Hall and Clifton Hill House, and with the welcome given them by the University. The Vice-Chancellor, Sir Philip Morris, gave a most hospitable reception on the first evening, and the Association Dinner was held in the Senior Common Room. A tour of Bristol enabled various local *ἀξιοθέητα* to be seen, with Mr. A. B. Cottle as guide, while another party was taken by Mr. G. C. Boon to the Roman villa at Kings Weston. Farther afield, members were conducted round Bath by Mr. V. E. Nash-Williams; others went to Wells, where they were shown the Cathedral by the Dean and were allowed to walk in the grounds of the Bishop's Palace—the swans behaved impeccably, and the view of the Cathedral, seen from the Palace under an April sky washed bright and clear by recent rain, will long be remembered.

The Principal of Brasenose gave his Presidential Address on 'Ancient History and Modern Education'; another memorable pleasure (not least to the many young members present) was Dr. Gilbert Murray's paper 'Dis Geniti'. Other papers were read by Mr. D. E. Eichholz, on 'Galen and his Environment'; by Mr. N. Gulley, on 'Some Aspects of Plato's Method'; by Mr. D. S. Colman, on '*Sabrinæ Corolla*: the Classics at Shrewsbury School under Butler and Kennedy'; by Professor

L. R. Palmer, on 'The Indo-European Origins of Greek Justice'; and by Mr. F. R. Dale, on 'Ancient Lyric Verse in English Quantity: a Method of Translation'. There were six contributors to 'Communications' (all of whom showed skilful economy of time): Canon C. B. Armstrong spoke on 'St. Paul's Use of the Term *ἐπίγνωσις*'; Mr. J. G. Griffith on '*βασιλεὺς βασιλέως*: Remarks on the History of a Title'; Mrs. G. T. W. Hooker on 'The Significance of Altars in Greek Religion'; Professor T. B. L. Webster on 'A Grave Relief of an Athenian Comic Poet' (possibly Aristophanes); Mr. R. D. Williams on 'The Effect of Elided *-que* on Word-accent in the Hexameter'; and Mr. J. M. Wyllie on 'The Oxford Latin Dictionary'.

Mr. Harold Nicolson was elected President for 1950, and an invitation was received from Liverpool to meet there next year. Plans were announced for a one-day meeting in London next January.

A dramatic diversion was offered, entitled *776 and All That*, written by Mr. A. B. Cottle (who was himself the *πρωταγωνιστής*), and incorporating a mysterious fragment of a Greek tragedy, discovered by the late Mr. W. E. Muir; it revealed some unexpected and remarkable aspects of classical life and literature, in which, *inter corusca sidera*, the Professor of Latin at Bristol made a gratifyingly majestic appearance as Ennius, and boys from Queen Elizabeth's Hospital interpreted the Song of the Arval Brethren with much primeval vigour. No injunction 'plaudite' was needed.

Deep gratitude is due to all concerned in making this such a happy meeting, especially to the University of Bristol, to the authorities of the two Halls and of the Refectory, and to Miss B. M. Weedon, Mr. N. Gulley, and Mr. F. W. E. Bowen, those *numina loci*

who planned everything so carefully and efficiently for the Association's pleasure.'

Helmantica is a new classical quarterly directed by the recently founded Faculty of Classical Humanities in the Pontifical University of Salamanca and taking its title from the Greek name of that town. The first number, which appeared this year, contains a general survey of 'Humanism, Philology and Linguistics' (J. Guillén), a short guide to classical bibliography (J. Jimenez), and articles on the twenty-fourth book of the *Odyssey* (E. Basabe), on traces of Roman culture in the place-names of the Pyrenees (A. Greira) and on Prudentius (I. Rodriguez). It also includes, in addition to notices of books, an account of the activities of the Agrupación Humanística Española, an association for the promotion of classical studies in the seminaries of Spain. We wish the editors and the association success in their enterprise.

Until last year Greece had no classical journal of its own. The enthusiasm of the *Εταιρεία Ἑλλήνων Φιλολόγων*, which was founded in 1948 and now has more than a thousand members, has supplied the want, and the first two half-yearly numbers of the *Ἰλάρων* appeared in 1949. The variety of the contents bears witness to the wide interests of Greek teachers: besides notices of books and domestic news, these numbers contain articles on Greek Tragedy, on Ancient Theories of Light, on State Care in Ancient Greece, on Sallust and Thucydides, and on St. Augustine, a series of notes on Greek orthography, and a specimen of a new Latin-Modern Greek dictionary which Professor Skassis has in preparation. We congratulate the *Εταιρεία* on its excellent beginning and wish its journal well.

The Prolegomena of Professor Whatmough's work on the Dialects of Ancient Gaul were published in *Harvard Studies*, lv. 1-85, in 1944. The news that the documentary section of the work is now to be published in a series of parts is

welcome; less welcome the announcement that—owing to the difficulty and expense of printing a technical work for which the demand will not be large—it will appear in the form of microfilm. The first part contains the evidence from the Alpine Regions and Narbonensis, and the *volumen*, reproducing 238 pages of manuscript, may be obtained from University Microfilms, Ann Arbor, Mich., at a cost of \$2.98. Full-size positive copies on paper may be had for 10 cents a page: at this rate the whole part on paper will cost more than \$20—a high price, even in these days, for an unbound, unstitched book. There is some comfort in the author's hope that the section of the work dealing with the Grammar, and also the Glossary, may be published in the ordinary way as well as on microfilm. One cannot but regret the necessity which confines to libraries (indeed, to certain libraries) a work of such importance to scholars in more than one field. Are the costs of printing to drive scholars back to the conditions of the Middle Ages?

A correspondent writes: 'W. H. D. Rouse, who was editor of the *Classical Review* from 1907 to 1920, and an editor of the Loeb Classical Library from its foundation until within a few years of his death, died on 10 February 1950 at the age of 87. His first-hand knowledge of India, where he was born, led to a keen interest in the country and its folk-lore, and for many years he was Reader in Sanskrit at Cambridge. He had also a first-hand knowledge of Greece and the Dodecanese, where he travelled extensively. Although he was concerned much with books—he wrote many, edited many, and possessed many—his interest in them was never 'bookish', and his highest praise of a book was that it was *fascinating*. Similarly, his love for the classical literatures was due not to their antiquity but to their living qualities and their immediate relevance to his own day; the same is true of his love for Greek folk-lore and for the traditional songs and dances of England. These things had a direct appeal for him, and

he made them have a similar appeal for others. It is therefore no accident that he is most widely known for his 'direct' method of teaching classical Greek and Latin at the Perse School, where he was Headmaster from 1902 to 1928. No less living method could have satisfied him; and with him for their guide boys learnt to read and speak them as living languages. So far as running a school was concerned, Rouse believed not in organization but in friendship, and as a result he gathered at the Perse a body of masters who, as his friends rather than his subordinates, had freedom to exercise to the full their various gifts, and thereby made him and the school justly famous. Almost to the last, boys from the school would go out to sit with him at Histon reading Homer, the greatest and most fascinating storyteller of all ages. Much of this same

spirit was embodied in his school textbook masterpiece, *A Greek Boy at Home*. He had also a great gift for writing Greek and Latin verse (as well as text-books on how to do it), and he could turn anything, including *The Times* agony column, into Greek iambics or Latin elegiacs. In addition to his knowledge of the classical languages he had a considerable knowledge of modern languages. Directness characterized his teaching, his speech, and indeed his whole personality. Jargon and slovenliness of speech he abominated. His own manner of speaking and reading aloud, whether in English or in other languages, was an unmistakable index of his spirit: intense clarity and precision, yet without fuss or exaggeration. He found the direct way, not only to other things, but also to the hearts of all who knew him.

IMMORTALITY IN PLATO'S SYMPOSIUM

THE difference, or apparent difference, between the *Phaedo* and the *Symposium* on the question of immortality has long troubled scholars. The doctrine of the *Phaedo* is clear: the individual man, composite of body and soul, is mortal, but the individual soul, conceived as a divine substance which is like the eternal Ideas and apprehends them, is separable from body, ungenerated, and imperishable: παντὸς μᾶλλον ἄρα . . . ψυχὴ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀνώλεθρον, καὶ τῷ ὄντι ἔσονται ἡμῶν αἱ ψυχαὶ ἐν Αἴδου (106 e). It is true that this conclusion is immediately followed by a confession on the part of Simmias that, though he can find no flaw in the preceding argument, he is doubtful about the capacity of human reason to determine so great a matter: and that Socrates approves this doubt and encourages him to yet further examination; yet, in view of Socrates' confidence that ἐὰν αὐτὰς (sc. τὰς ὑποθέσεις τὰς πρώτας) ἱκανῶς διέλητε, ὡς ἐγῶμαι, ἀκολουθήσετε τῷ λόγῳ (107 b) we are justified in saying—whatever be our own qualms—that Plato regards his doctrine as proved beyond all question.

That the *Symposium* and *Phaedo* are close in date of composition few will contest, though it seems impossible to decide which is the earlier; and since Diotima's speech has much to say about immortality one would expect to find the same doctrine, if not openly expressed, at least implied there. But as everyone knows, it is not openly expressed, and the only passages where it could be maintained to be implied are 208 a-b and 212 a. In the former passage D. has asserted that any mortal creature (πάν τὸ θνητόν) can survive only vicariously, by leaving behind another like itself: αὐτῇ τῇ μηχανῇ . . . θνητὸν ἀθανασίας μετέχει, καὶ σῶμα καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα. The words καὶ τᾶλλα πάντα refer to the mental furniture which has just been mentioned, particularly to ἐπιστήμη, and so far from suggesting that ψυχὴ is able to survive in a non-vicarious sense, they put it on a level with σῶμα in this regard. Nor can D.'s next words ἀθάνατον δὲ ἄλλη (where the conjecture ἀδύνατον is quite unwarranted) contain any such suggestion; plainly their meaning is that the gods ἀθανασίας μετέχουσι in the ordinary sense indicated three

lines earlier in the words τῷ παντάπασιν τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ εἶναι ὥσπερ τὸ θεῖον.¹

The second passage, 212 a, is near the end of D.'s speech, and her words are as plain as could be wished. The man who beholds and consorts with Ideal Beauty, and he alone, will beget not images of virtue but true virtue, and inasmuch as he does so he becomes dear to the gods and immortal *par excellence*: ἐνταῦθα αὐτῷ μοναχοῦ γενήσεται . . . τίκτειν οὐκ εἰδῶλα ἀρετῆς, ἀτε οὐκ εἰδῶλου ἐφαπτομένην, ἀλλὰ ἀληθῆ . . . τεκόντι δὲ ἀρετὴν ἀληθῆ καὶ θρεψαμένῳ ὑπάρχει θεοφιλεῖ γενέσθαι, καὶ εἴπερ τῷ ἄλλῳ ἀνθρώπῳ ἀθανάτῳ καὶ ἐκείνῳ.

In none of the commentaries known to me is it clearly pointed out that the immortality here promised does not spring directly from the apprehension of αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν, but from the begetting of true virtue (sc. in another's soul);² and that consequently the philosopher can no more than the ordinary man become immortal (note γενέσθαι) save by vicarious self-perpetuation, τόκος or γέννησις. Yet surely the recognition of this point is of the first importance. Instead we find such misleading statements as 'The philosopher, we are told, is especially entitled to be called immortal in virtue of his ability to see ideal truth':³ 'This (sc. the apprehension of the Idea of Beauty) alone makes life worth living for the philosopher, and confers upon him immortality so far as that is attainable for man':⁴ 'This ascent which leads to the sight of the beautiful itself . . . is also the way to a

life of virtue, the friendship with God and immortality'.⁴ Even Dr. Bury, in the illuminating discussion of D.'s discourse in his edition of the dialogue, although recognizing that 'all that is clearly shown is the fact of posthumous survival and influence' (p. xlv), says, a little earlier, 'while, in so far as he is an ἄνθρωπος, a ζῶν, a ὅλον compounded of two diverse elements, body and soul, the philosopher is not entirely ἀθάνατος but still subject to the sway of sad mortality, yet in so far as he is a philosopher, a purely rational soul, grasping eternal objects, he is immortal' (my italics). This seems to me a clear instance of reading the *Phaedo* into the *Symposium*, where it will not fit.

'There is not a word in the *Symposium*', says A. E. Taylor, 'to suggest that the ψυχή is perishable.'⁵ That is quite true: but the very negativeness of the statement seems to imply that there is not a word to suggest that the ψυχή is imperishable. I do not think there is, and we ought to face this fact and try to account for it. One simple and conceivable explanation would be that the *Symposium* is earlier than the *Meno* and the *Phaedo*, and Plato had not yet advanced beyond the position of Socrates in the *Apology*, who will not affirm a life after death though he plainly hopes for it. Yet few people will be content with that explanation: for one thing the *Symposium* position is not really agnostic; for another the dialogue pretty clearly belongs to the period of Plato's maturity, and the metaphysics implied in Diotima's discourse seems to be farther advanced than that of the *Meno*. More satisfactory, though not, I think, fully adequate, is Dr. Bury's contention (p. xlvii) that 'it is merely perverse to attempt to isolate the doctrine of the *Symposium* from that of its natural fellows, or to assume that the teaching of Diotima is intended to be a complete exposition of the subject of immortality'. To this it may be objected that the problem arises not so much from what D. leaves out as from her positive state-

¹ Cf. G. M. A. Grube, *Plato's Thought*, p. 149: 'To make the passage at all compatible with the *Phaedo* we must include the intellect under the ἀθάνατον which is immortal ἄλλῃ. But certainly no one who had not the other dialogues before him would take this to refer to anything but the gods.'

² The language of 212 a is ambiguous between τόκος ἐν αὐτῷ and τόκος ἐν ἄλλῳ, perhaps designedly, for the one must precede the other. But in view of the whole tenor of the speech, and particularly of 209 c and 210 c, it is doubtless τόκος ἐν ἄλλῳ that P. has predominantly in mind. It may be noted incidentally that εἰδῶλα ἀρετῆς implies a reference back to 209 c, where D. describes what Jaeger (*Paideia*, i. 193 ff.) has called 'aristocratic culture' particularly as seen in the poems of Theognis. (I owe this point to Mr. F. H. Sandbach.)

³ Gaye, *The Platonic Conception of Immortality*, p. 28.

⁴ Shorey, *What Plato Said*, p. 196.

⁴ T. Gomperz, *Greek Thinkers*, ii. 392.

⁵ Plato, *the Man and his Work*, p. 228, note 1.

ments, and in particular from that assertion in the early part of her speech which dominates and governs her whole exposition, *τοῦτω γὰρ τῷ τρόπῳ πᾶν τὸ θνητὸν σώζεται, οὐ τῷ παντάπασιν τὸ αὐτὸ αἰεὶ εἶναι ὥσπερ τὸ θεῖον, ἀλλὰ τῷ τὸ ἀπὸν καὶ παλαιούμενον ἕτερον νέον ἐγκαταλείπειν οἷον αὐτὸ ἦν* (208 a). It simply will not do to say that this is only an assertion about the mortal compound of soul and body, or about the body alone, and so quite without prejudice to what happens to the divine part of the compound, the *ψυχή*. Plato cannot have meant us to read into D.'s words the very opposite of their plain implication, which is that no human being (and no animal) can survive in any other sense than that here indicated. Moreover, a great part of the discourse is concerned with the very question, how does the individual *soul* partake of immortality; and the answer is, as we have seen, in terms of that spiritual *γέννησις* or *τόκος* whose highest exemplification is found in the philosopher's transmission of *ἀληθὴς ἀρετή* to a beloved disciple.

Nor, again, will it do to say that the doctrine is that of Diotima, and that Plato is not to be taken as necessarily endorsing her views; for it is Socrates who reports those views, and fully accepts them; moreover the core of the speech—the ascent to Ideal Beauty—is unquestionably Platonic doctrine.

The only solution I can see is that the *Symposium* was written when Plato had come to feel doubts about the validity of that final argument for the soul's immortality which the *Phaedo* had found to be the only decisive argument. That he should have done so is perhaps a fair inference from the fact that later works, *Rep.* x, *Phaedrus*, and *Laws* x, adduce other arguments. In particular he may have recognized, as modern scholars in general recognize, that the final argument of the *Phaedo* had done nothing to prove the survival and pre-existence of the individual soul, whatever it may have proved about soul in a collective sense. The *Symposium* shows us a relapse into temporary scepticism; it drops the claim that soul, collective

or individual, is imperishable. Nevertheless, it salvages what can be salvaged: and it may well have seemed to Plato that Diotima's doctrine preserved at least so much of the *Phaedo* doctrine as was of direct moral value: the soul's ability to apprehend the moral Ideas, and the duty of the philosopher to beget that true virtue which arises from their apprehension: a duty which is also a fulfilment, a satisfaction (albeit partial) of the soul's deepest need, of its *ἔρως ἀθανασίας*, which may enable him to assert in no merely metaphorical sense *non omnis moriar*. For to him εἴπερ τῷ ἄλλῳ is it granted to become immortal; it is in very truth his own self, his own *ψυχή*, that lives on, even as the *ψυχή* of Socrates lived on and grew on in Plato, and would live on and grow on in Plato's school, so long as it remained true to the spirit and teaching of Socrates.

I am well aware that the solution of the problem here offered will seem unacceptable to many scholars; in particular it will be justly objected that it involves believing that Plato has abandoned, albeit temporarily, both that interdependence of individual immortality and the doctrine of Ideas which is so emphatically asserted at *Phaedo* 76 e (where the plural *τὰς ἡμετέρας ψυχὰς* is to be noted) and the doctrine of *ἀνάμνησις* on which it is grounded. To this I would reply that the omission of any reference to *ἀνάμνησις* in Diotima's speech is, to all appearance, deliberate: its absence from 210 a-b is striking, and needs to be accounted for. But I can only account for it by fitting it into the solution above suggested: if individual immortality is to be dropped, *ἀνάμνησις* must go too. I do not suppose that Plato was happy about dropping either, but he may have felt that the retention of *ἀνάμνησις* was, after all, not strictly essential in a context having no reference to individual pre-existence, but only to individual survival.¹

R. HACKFORTH.

Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge.

¹ My best thanks are due to Mr. W. K. C. Guthrie and Mr. W. Hamilton for reading the draft of this paper and for valuable criticism.

DEMOSTHENES LV. 21

τοσοῦτον τοίνυν διαφέρουσιν οὗτοι τῶν ἄλλων, ὥστε πεπονθότες μὲν οὐδέν,, πολλῶν δὲ πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα βεβλαμμένων, μόνου δικάζεσθαι τετολμήκασιν οὗτοί μοι. καίτοι πᾶσι μᾶλλον ἐνεχώρει τοῦτο πράττειν. οὗτοι μὲν γάρ, εἰ καὶ τι πεπόνθασιν, αὐτοὶ δὲ αὐτοὺς βεβλαμμένοι συκοφαντοῦσιν· ἐκεῖνοι δ', εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο, τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν.

VARIOUS proposals have been made for supplementing εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο. Sandys understood διαφέρουσιν, translating rather loosely 'whereas the rest of my neighbours, not to mention any other point, at any rate are open to no such imputation as this': Paley quotes Kennedy's 'while the rest, however negligent they may have been, are at any rate chargeable with nothing of this kind' with approval, but says that the precise ellipse is obscure. Of earlier commentators, Reiske understood εἰ καὶ κατὰ μηδὲν ἄλλο περὶ αὐτῶν ἔστι (sic) λέγειν, ὅτι μηδεμίαν [οὐδεμίαν] αἰτίαν ἔχουσι, while G. H. Schaefer thought Reiske 'a vero loci sensu multum aberravisse', and himself propounded εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο πεποιήκασιν τοῦ φυλάττεσθαι τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος ἐσομένην βλάβην. There is also a difference of opinion as to the precise meaning of τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν, though here the difficulty narrows to a choice between two different interpretations. As the meaning of the whole period οὗτοι μὲν γάρ . . . αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν hinges upon the interpretation we put upon τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν, I propose to deal with these words before proceeding to εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο.

It will be useful first of all to recognize that the passage contains *two* sub-paragraphs and two distinct arguments. The first sub-paragraph (from τοσοῦτον τοίνυν διαφ. to τετολμήκασιν οὗτοί μοι) says in effect that Callicles' action in claiming damages from the defendant constitutes conduct so 'different' from that of the other neighbours (i.e. so much more unreasonable and shameful) as to amount to a *τόλμα*, because he alone has taken such action, though the others' losses had been great, whereas his had been negligible (πεπονθότες οὐδέν). The fact that they had suffered greater loss does not mean of course that the others

had a better case against the defendant, but only that they might be regarded as having a greater stimulus to present a case. The second sub-paragraph (from καίτοι to ἔχουσιν) states the fresh point that the other neighbours were actually in a better position (legally) to take action against the defendant: it is not here a question of *τόλμα*, but of *capacity* to take legal action (πᾶσι μᾶλλον ἐνεχώρει τοῦτο πράττειν). That the argument is different from that of the preceding sub-paragraph is shown by the fact that what was there denied is here, for purposes of argument, admitted (εἰ καὶ τι πεπόνθασιν, 'assuming that they have suffered loss worthy of mention'). The reason why the neighbours were in a better position than Callicles to present a case is given in οὗτοι μὲν γάρ . . . αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν. But what is this reason? To know this we must decide on the meaning of τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν. The usual meaning of αἰτίαν ἔχειν is 'to be open to an imputation' (see Sandys's note ad loc.), and that seems to be the meaning here. But disagreement arises whether to refer the 'imputation' to συκοφαντοῦσιν¹ or to αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλαμμένοι.² These interpretations lead to quite different explanations of πᾶσι μᾶλλον ἐνεχώρει τοῦτο πράττειν.

When a passage, textually impeccable, which must presumably have been readily understood in an unambiguous sense by a Greek audience, gives rise to quite opposite interpretations by modern scholars, it is necessary to assume that some factor (or factors) essential to the clarity of the passage

¹ Sandys actually refers the αἰτία to the whole complex αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ. συκοφαντοῦσιν, though he appears to emphasize συκοφαντοῦσιν ('The imputation is συκοφαντία, bringing a vexatious charge when they are themselves to blame for want of precaution'). But, as will be shown, the αἰτία is robbed of point if not only συκοφαντία but also personal responsibility for loss sustained is included under it: the αἰτία must refer either to συκοφαντοῦσιν or to αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ., but not to both.

² So Schaefer. But he gives no exposition of the passage, and it is necessary to supply one in defence of his opinion.

was present for the Greek audience but is not for us. The factor in this case was surely emphasis in delivery. Two predicates are combined in αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλαμμένοι συκοφαντοῦσιν, and on one of them an emphasis was placed by the speaker. If αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ. was emphasized, then τοιαύτην naturally refers to it; if on the other hand συκοφαντοῦσιν was emphatic, that is the word to which τοιαύτην refers. The Greek was saved the trouble of pondering which sense to choose by the emphasis in delivery; we, who do not know where the emphasis fell, must decide by logic.

Let us first see what case can be made for the Schaefer version. To begin with, Schaefer misunderstood αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ. itself. Referring this phrase to p. 1278. 2 ff. (= § 22), where it is stated that Callicles had contrived, by extending his own wall and throwing the resultant rubble into the roadway, to make the road narrower and higher, Schaefer implies that it was by reason of this action that the defendant accused Callicles and his followers of having been 'responsible for their own losses'. But the sentence in § 22 begins *ὅτι μὲν αὐτὸς ἐξημέρτηκε, πρῶτον μὲν τὴν ὁδὸν στενοτέραν ποιήσας κτλ.*, and the reason why this particular building activity of Callicles is mentioned at all is explained in § 29 *καὶ ἐγὼ μὲν, ὃν προσήκεν ἀγανακτεῖν τῆς ὁδοῦ στενοτέρας γεγενημένης κτλ.* αὐτὸς ἐξημέρτηκε is 'has himself done serious wrong', sc. 'to me', as he accuses me of having done it to him: the extension (and consequent renewal) of Callicles' wall was more likely to occasion flooding of the defendant's property than of his own: hence the indignation which the defendant claims he might reasonably have felt. The only way in which Callicles could have been responsible for his own flooding was by *neglecting to repair* his own wall (whether the old wall or the new one after the alteration), and such negligence, not the alteration, is the basis of the gibe αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ. (cf. § 20 *τὸ δ' εἰσπεσὼν ὕδωρ ἔβλαψε μὲν οἶμαι πολλάκις ἤδη πολλοὺς μὴ φυλαξαμένους, ἔβλαψε δὲ καὶ νῦν τοῦτον* sc. *οὐ φυλαξάμενον*).

With this necessary correction, we may proceed to state the case for the Schaefer version. αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλ. was singled out, we will assume, by the speaker for emphasis, in order that τοιαύτην might refer to it. True, συκοφαντοῦσιν is grammatically the main verb; but it is not unknown for a participle to be more important than the main verb of its sentence, and συκοφαντοῦσιν may have had *some* emphasis placed upon it, as a piece of extra abuse incidental to the argument. We might translate 'have made losses for which they are themselves responsible the basis of their charge, pettifoggers that they are!' τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν will then mean 'cannot be open to any such imputation as that of having been themselves responsible, through negligence, for their own losses'. The whole argument will be that the others were in a stronger position than Callicles to claim damages from the defendant, because, whereas he may have the countercharge made against him that he is himself responsible for his own losses, they could not.

This argument is logical, but unrealistic. Supposing one of the neighbours actually to have taken a case against the defendant, can we imagine a litigant throwing any weight on a plea which amounts to 'Well, I certainly didn't cause my losses through any negligence of my own'? How could such a claim have been substantiated? Furthermore, the words τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν assert with a tone of assurance that the neighbours (according to this interpretation) have not erred through negligence: is it conceivable that of πολλῶν πολλὰ καὶ μεγάλα βεβλαμμένων none had shown negligence, or that the defendant could assert confidently that none had?

Now consider the other version. αὐτοὶ δι' αὐτοὺς βεβλαμμένοι has the same meaning, but is subordinate, both in emphasis and in logic, to συκοφαντοῦσιν: Callicles is using loss (really caused by his own negligence) as an excuse to present a *pettifogging charge*. Callicles has always played the συκοφάντης, as the history of his earlier actions against

the defendant shows.¹ The present case is only a particular instance of his *general συκοφαντία*. *τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν* now refers to *συκοφαντοῦσιν*: no one can say the other neighbours are *συκοφάνται*: they have no past record of pettifogging persecution of the defendant to throw suspicion upon their motives.² *συκοφαντία* was a serious charge. Here we have an *adequate* reason for the statement *πάσι μᾶλλον ἐνεχώρει τοῦτο πράττειν*. We may conclude that this version is correct, that *συκοφαντία* had the emphasis, and that *τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν* means 'at least cannot be open to the imputation of *συκοφαντία*'.

It remains to explain *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο*. It is not necessary to discuss Sandys's *διαφέρουσιν* or Schaefer's *πεποιήκασιν τοῦ φυλάττεσθαι τὴν ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος ἔσομένην βλάβην* on their individual merits, because both are open to the overriding objection that they do not conform to the *usage* of *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο* and similar elliptical phrases. It is usage here, and not merely speech-emphasis, which supplied the missing factor in interpretation: the editors had overlooked the usage underlying *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο*, and so had to cast around in the context, with logic alone as a guide, for a possible supplement for the ellipse; the mind of the Greek, on the other hand, was guided by familiar usage automatically towards the source from which the supplement was to be derived; he would not have had time to ponder. The following passages will serve to illustrate this usage (which is not treated, to my knowledge, in any of the grammars):

Dem. viii. 62 πόθεν οἶσεθε νῦν αὐτὸν ὑβρίζειν ὑμᾶς . . . καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους εὖ ποιοῦντ', εἰ μηδὲν ἔλλ', ἐξαπατᾶν, ὑμῖν δ' ἀπειλεῖν ἤδη;

Dem. xix. 95 ἔλλ' ὅρᾳ τοῦθ' ὅτι ἐν μὲν τοῖς ὑφ' αὐτοῦ πεπραγμένοις ἀγαθὸν μὲν οὐδὲν ἔστιν, ἅπαντα

¹ Cf. § 1 οὕτω διατέθηκε με *συκοφαντῶν*, ὥστε πρῶτον μὲν τὸν ἀνεψιὸν τὸν ἑαυτοῦ κατεσκεύασεν ἀμφισβητεῖν μοι τῶν χωρίων κτλ.

² This is why the *αἰτία*, if it is to have point, must be referred to *συκοφαντοῦσιν alone*: it is the *general συκοφαντία* of Callicles that makes it hard for him (so the defendant would have us believe) to present a case; it is the lack of any presumption (from previous actions not necessarily involving negligence) of *συκοφαντία* that places the others in a better position to present a case.

δὲ τὰδικήματα, ἣ δ' ὑπὲρ τῆς εἰρήνης ἀπολογία, καὶ εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, τοῖνομα γοῦν ἔχει φιλόφρωνον.

Aeschin. iii. 154 τίς γὰρ οὐκ ἂν ἀλγήσειεν ἄνθρωπος Ἑλλήν . . . ἀναμνησθεῖς . . . ἐκεῖνό γε, εἰ μηδὲν ἕτερον, ὅτι ταύτη ποτὲ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ . . . κτλ.

Plat. *Rep.* 502 α βούλει οὖν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, μὴ ἦττον φῶμεν αὐτοὺς ἀλλὰ παντάπασιν πράους γεγενῆσθαι καὶ πεπεισθαι, ἵνα, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, αἰσχυρθέντες ὁμολογήσωσιν; ἄλλο codd., ἄλλὰ Ast.

Plat. *Rep.* 509 c καὶ μηδαμῶς γ', ἔφη, παύση, εἰ μὴ τι, ἀλλὰ τὴν περὶ τὸν ἥλιον ὁμοιότητα αὐ διεξιῶν, εἴ πῃ ἀπολείπευ.

Plat. *Sympr.* 222 d ἄλλ' εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, ὦ θαυμάσιε, ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν ἔα Ἀγάθωνα κατακείμενον.

Plat. *Meno*, 86 e εἰ μὴ τι οὖν, ἀλλὰ σμικρόν γέ μοι τῆς ἀρχῆς χάλασον, καὶ συγχώρησον . . . κτλ.

Xen. *Anab.* vii. 8. 3 ἰδὼν δὲ τὰ ἱερά ὁ Εὐκλείδης εἶπεν ὅτι πειθούτο αὐτῷ μὴ εἶναι χρήματα. ἅλλ' οἶδα, ἔφη, ὅτι κἂν μέλλῃ ποτ' ἔσεσθαι, φαίνεται τι ἐμπόδιον, ἂν μηδὲν ἄλλο, σὺ σαυτῷ.

Xen. *Hell.* iv. 6. 13 ἐδέοντό τε, εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο, ἀλλὰ τοσοῦτόν γε χρόνον καταμεῖναι αὐτόν . . . κτλ.

Lucian, xlvii. 8 οὐκ ὀλίγα γὰρ πρὸς τῆς φιλοσοφίας ὠφέληνται οἱ πολλοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ γάρ, εἰ μηδὲν ἄλλο, αἰδοῖ γοῦν τοῦ σχήματος μετριώτερα διαμαρτάνουσι.

Soph. *frag.* 23

ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐν φύλλοισιν αἰγείρου μακρᾶς, κἂν ἄλλο μηδὲν, ἀλλὰ τοῦκείνης κάρα ἱκνήσης αὐρας ἀνακουφίζει πτέρον.

κινεῖ τις αὐρά κἀνακουφίζει Dindorf.

The list shows the existence of an elliptical usage, in which a negative protasis, containing as substantive or (possibly? v. p. 49, n. 3 *infra*) adverbial element a combination of *ἄλλο* with *μηδὲν* or *τι*, and with a verbal supplement understood from the following *apodosis*, is used to emphasize that *apodosis* or some part of it, this emphasis being achieved (grammatically speaking) through the contrast between *ἄλλο* and its complement, which is to be found in the *apodosis*, the emphasis being usually further strengthened by the association of *γε*, *γοῦν*, or *ἀλλά* with the emphatic element in the *apodosis*. In all the passages, with the exception of the Aeschines, the ellipse *looks forward* to an emphasis. In one set of cases the emphasis is on a word or phrase of the *apodosis* (ἐξαπατᾶν, τοῦνομα φιλόφρωνον, αἰσχυρθέντες, ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν, σὺ σαυτῷ, τοῦκείνης κάρα); in the others it is upon a clause or upon the whole *apodosis* (τὴν περὶ τὸν ἥλιον ὁμοιότητα αὐ διεξιῶν, σμικρόν γέ μοι τῆς ἀρχῆς χάλασον κτλ., τοσοῦτόν γε χρόνον καταμεῖναι αὐτόν κτλ., αἰδοῖ τοῦ σχήματος μετριώτερα δι-

αμαρτάνουσι).¹ The elliptical phrase is therefore not to be thought of as apart from the apodosis, but is dominated by the apodosis, of the thought of which it forms an integral part. This would no doubt be indicated by the speaker in delivery: the elliptical phrase would be spoken quickly, without much pause between it and the apodosis, and the rhythm would be a rising one culminating in the emphasis in the apodosis. An audience listening to the sentence spoken in this way would supply the predicate in the ellipse from the apodosis or the emphatic part of it which would be predominant in their thought.

Another principle which emerges from the list is that the supplement to the ellipse may be derived, not from the actual words of the apodosis, but from its thought; e.g. in Dem. viii. 62 the full expression would be *εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλ' ἀδικεῖ*, the general verb being understood from *ἐξαπατᾶν*, and *ἄλλο* gaining a pejorative sense from the same source ('if he does you no worse wrong'); in xix. 95, *καὶ εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν ἔχει*, the generalized *ἀγαθὸν* being derived from *τοῦνομα φιλάνθρωπον*; in Lucian,

xlvii. 8 *εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο ποιοῦσιν ὥστε βελτίους διάγειν* or the like.²

In the list of passages the elliptical phrase presents itself in two forms, according as we have *μὴδὲν* or *τι*.³ The orators seem to prefer the first, Plato the second; Xenophon has both. Of the two forms, that with *τι* shows less attention to grammar, since, if we attempt to supply the ellipse and make the construction grammatical, we shall find it necessary, in all but one of the examples, to change *εἰ* to *ἐάν*. Apart from this, the same principle holds as for the *μὴδὲν* examples, namely, that the supplement is to be derived from the following apodosis. Thus in *Rep.* 502 a the full construction would be *ἐάν μὴ τι ἄλλο γινόμενοι* or the like, the appropriate verb of general meaning being supplied from the emphatic *αἰσχυρθέντες*. *Symp.* 222 d has already been dealt with. In the other *τι* instances it is not so easy to

² We might, in Dem. viii. 62 and Lucian, if we considered those passages only individually, understand *ὑβρίζει* and *ὠφέληται* respectively from what has gone before. But this method of interpretation would not suit the other passages. Nor is *ὠφέληται* an accurate supplement for Lucian's ellipse. Lucian's point is that the benefit from philosophy is shown by an *improvement in behaviour*. True, *ὑβρίζει* and *ὠφέληται* prepare us for the meaning of the respective apodoses: that does not alter the fact that it is from those apodoses themselves and the thought underlying them that the ellipse is to be supplemented.

³ Riddell (*Digest*, § 20) offers what seems an entirely misconceived explanation of the *τι* instances in Plato. Comparing usages such as *Apol.* 20 d *ἵνα τί ταῦτα λέγεις* ('τί in itself is the full representative complement of the sentence'), he says of our instances: 'The sentence is complete; the *τι* and the *τι ἄλλο* stand for full propositions.' The usages he compares are really quite different from ours. In *ἵνα τί ταῦτα λέγεις*, *τί* stands for a full proposition, because there is nothing to define *τί* except the full proposition which the question assumes will follow; in our instances, on the other hand, *τι* (*ἄλλο*) is defined by its complement in the apodosis: if that complement is a substantive, *τι* (*ἄλλο*) will be a substantive also, and it is necessary to supply a verb in the ellipse with which *τι* (*ἄλλο*) can enter into grammatical relationship. This is made quite clear by *Symp.* 222 d (*τι ἄλλο* is defined by its complement *ἐν μέσῳ ἡμῶν Ἀγάθωνα κατακείσθαι*, itself a virtual substantive and the object of *ἔα*; a part of *ἐάν* is to be supplied in the ellipse to govern *τι ἄλλο*: had the clause been completed, it would have been *ἐάν μὴ τι ἄλλο ἔασης*), by the passages from the orators, and by *Soph. frag.* 23, where Pearson rightly remarks that *ἄλλο μὴδὲν*

¹ To the forward-looking character of the idiom the Aeschines passage is only an apparent exception, because the emphatic element is anticipated by *ἐκεῖνός γε*. Also forward-looking is the *εἰ μὴ διὰ* type of ellipse (e.g. Plat. *Gorgias*, 516e *εἰ μὴ διὰ τὸν πρῦτανιν, ἐνέπεσεν ἄν*, cf. Goodwin, *M.T.*, § 476, 3). In general, forward-looking subordinate clauses and constructions in Greek deserve further study particularly where, to the reader, their nature tends to be obscured by preceding matter in the same sentence. Interesting examples are Herod. i. 60 . . . *μηχανῶνται . . . πρῆγμα εὐθρότατον . . . μακρῷ, ἐπεὶ γε ἀπεκρίθη ἐκ παλαιτέρου τοῦ βαρβάρου ἔθνος τὸ Ἑλληνικόν . . ., εἰ καὶ τότε γε κτλ.*; Antiph. ii. 10 *ἀπολύεσθαι δὲ ὑφ' ὑμῶν, εἰ καὶ εἰκότως μὲν ὄντως δὲ μὴ ἀπέκτεινα τὸν ἄνδρα, πολλὸ μᾶλλον δίκαιός εἰμι*. In the first case, the *ἐπεὶ γε* clause looks forward to *τότε γε*; in the second, the *εἰ καὶ* clause to *πολλὸ μᾶλλον*, but neither fact is immediately grasped by the reader. On the other hand, both passages properly spoken would offer no difficulty to a Greek. Similarly in Herod. ii. 101 *τῶν δὲ ἄλλων βασιλέων, οὐ γὰρ ἔλεγον οὐδεμίαν ἔργων ἀπόδεξιν, κατ' οὐδὲν εἶναι λαμπρότητος, πλὴν ἑνός τοῦ ἐσχάτου αὐτῶν Μοίριος*, I believe that *τῶν ἄλλων βασιλέων* looks forward to *πλὴν ἑνός* (= *οὐδένα πλὴν ἑνός*), with which it goes partitively, and that it is unnecessary to assume an anacoluthon, or understand *οὐδένα* from *κατ' οὐδὲν εἶναι λαμπρότητος* (as How and Wells explain the construction).

supply an exact form of words, because the emphasis in the apodosis (the *point d'appui* for supplementing the ellipse) is spread either over a clause or over the whole apodosis. There is also, in these instances, a certain general *tone*, built up in the context, and culminating in the apodosis, which contributes to the sense of the ellipse. The general implication is that the speaker is asking that something shall be done which he has every reason to expect *will* be done, precisely because it falls short of what he might reasonably have demanded of his interlocutor: his minimum demand (so to speak) is presented in the apodosis, and the fact that it *is* a minimum demand, where more might have been expected, is conveyed by the elliptical phrase. Thus in *Rep.* 509 c Glaucon has been made uneasy by Socrates' remark, *οὐ γὰρ αἴτιος, ἀναγκάζων τὰ ἐμοὶ δοκοῦντα περὶ αὐτοῦ λέγειν*, which suggests that Socrates may not wish to proceed further with his exposition. Glaucon's own eager nature is such that he cannot be fully satisfied by anything but complete knowledge of the whole field of discussion. His minimum demand, however, is that the sun-analogy should be fully expounded, in case there are any flaws or omissions (*εἴ πη ἀπολείπεις*). So he says 'But please *do go on*' (*μηδαμῶς παύσῃ = παντὶ τρόπῳ διατέλει*) 'at least to the extent of developing the sun-analogy': if *εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο* had been expanded into a full construction, it appears that it would have been *ἐὰν μὴ τι ἄλλο ποιῶν διατελῆς*.¹ But *τι ἄλλο* here implies 'anything else *to satisfy my sense of logic and my desire for complete knowledge*'. In *Meno* 86 e Socrates, having failed to induce Meno to argue from fundamentals, accepts Meno's faulty method of discussion as a *phis-*

must be in the same case as *κἄρα*, i.e. *μηδὲν ἄλλο* is a substantive. As the preponderance of evidence seems to be in favour of *μηδὲν ἄλλο* and *τι (ἄλλο)* being used as *substantives*, and not adverbially, I have thought it best to treat them as substantives throughout. But in Lucian, loc. cit. *μηδὲν ἄλλο* might be adverbial (sc. *εἰ μὴδὲν ἄλλο βελτίους διάγουσι*).

¹ Here a part of the apodosis precedes the elliptical phrase, but the part which is emphatic *vis-à-vis* *εἰ μὴ τι* follows it.

aller, but thinks it reasonable to ask that its basis should be restated in a more scientific form ('At least relax your method of stating the argument': we might understand *ἐὰν μὴ τι ἄλλο ποιήσης τοῦ λόγου χάριν*). In Xen. *Hell.* iv. 6. 13 the Achaeans, disappointed in Agesilaus, because he has not fulfilled their (to them) reasonable expectation that he would achieve some concrete results, beg him 'at least to remain in the field long enough to interrupt the Acarnanians' sowing': *εἰ μὴ τι ἄλλο ποιήσειεν ὥστε σφῶν τὴν βούλησιν ἀποπληροῦν* is a possible supplement.² In these examples it is clear that the supplement to the elliptical phrase cannot be supplied from an exact form of words contained in the apodosis, but must be supplied from the thought-processes which find their culmination in the apodosis.

As regards the *τι* examples in general, it seems a fair conclusion from the loose use of *εἰ*,³ and also from the tendency to omit *ἄλλο*, that these represent the more conversational form of the elliptical usage we are considering, a form for which, through familiar use, a definite construction had ceased to be envisaged, and which tended to crystallize into a mere adverbial phrase.⁴

We have seen that two principles govern both forms of the elliptical phrase: (1) that it is to be supplemented from the following apodosis or some part of it, (2) that the supplement may be derived, not from the expressed words of the apodosis, but from its underlying thought. Applying these principles to

² *εἰ*, in the historic sequence, is here grammatical. But it may be doubted whether we should have had *ἐάν*, even had the sequence been primary.

³ Whereas in the *μηδὲν* instances *ἐάν* is used when grammatically necessary, Soph. loc. cit., Xen. *Anab.* vii. 8. 3; cf. Dem. xxiii. 156 *λογισμὸν λαβὼν, ὅτι ληφθήσεται, κἂν μηδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων, τῷ γε λιμῷ*.

⁴ For similar crystallized phrases cf. the use of *εἰ δὲ μὴ* = 'otherwise' (Goodwin, *M.T.*, § 478) and of *κἂν* in Plat. *Meno*, 72 c, *Rep.* 477 a and 579 d (Thompson, *Syntax of Att. Gk.* 189. 3 (c), (2)). By a coincidence, Ps.-Longinus has this use of *κἂν* in an ellipse similar to those we are considering, *Περὶ Ὑψους* 33. 4 *οὐδὲν ἤττον οἶμαι τὰς μείζονας αἰτίας . . . τὴν τοῦ πρωτείου ψήφον μᾶλλον αἰε φέρεσθαι, κἂν εἰ μηδενὸς ἑτέρου, τῆς μεγαλοφροσύνης αὐτῆς ἕνεκα*.

Dem. iv. 21, we shall expect to supplement *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο* from *τοιαύτην γ' οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔχουσιν*. The words themselves suggest no obvious supplement. But the underlying thought is 'are in this particular respect (absence of *αἰτία*) more fitted to present a case against me'. From this I believe a Greek audience would have understood *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο ἔχουσιν ὥστε ἐγγυωρεῖν αὐτοῖς δικάζεσθαι μοι*, 'even if they dispose of no other plea enabling them to present a case against me'.¹

The reason given for the other neighbours being more fitted to present a case is a negative one, as it consists, not in any positive grounds on which to base a case, but in the absence of a counter-plea which might be used against them. To bring out this negative aspect I imagine also that an emphasis was placed upon *αἰτίαν*, and that *ἄλλο*, by contrast with the emphatic *αἰτίαν*, acquired the sense of 'positive': 'whereas they, even if they dispose of no *positive* plea enabling them to present a case against me, at least have the negative advantage that they cannot have this *counter-plea* brought against them'.

¹ Reiske, I believe alone of the editors, was led aright by his instinct to seek the supplement in the apodosis. But his version will not do, because it hints that the defendant had some reason for complaint against the other neighbours, and not merely against Callicles. Such an assumption is nowhere implied in the speech, and its introduction here is either irrelevant to the argument that the other neighbours had a better case than Callicles, or tends to contradict it, by drawing attention to material upon which the defendant might draw for a defence against them.

Whatever sense we take from the passage must in the long run stand or fall by the criterion of whether it would have been immediately intelligible to a Greek audience. To my mind, given the context and the argument (*πᾶσι μᾶλλον ἐνεχώρει τοῦτο πράττειν*), given the usage of current speech which would lead the attention forward from *εἰ καὶ μηδὲν ἄλλο* to the succeeding clause, given the *γὰρ* which links the two clauses closely in thought, and finally given the orator's delivery, which would pronounce the whole sentence in such a way as to lead up to the emphasis on *αἰτίαν*, the sense which I have outlined is the only one which would have occurred to a Greek audience. It is, however, an *implicit* sense, and cannot be fully brought out in translation. The whole passage might be rendered somewhat as follows: 'So exceptional then is the behaviour of these men that, though they have suffered nothing worthy of mention . . ., whereas many others *have* suffered many grievous losses, yet they are the ones, the only ones, who have had the impudence to go to law against me. Yet not one of the others was not in a better position to take such action. For my accusers' action is a *pettifogg*ing one (they having brought their losses upon themselves, even supposing those to have amounted to anything); whereas there is at least nothing to suggest *that* imputation in the case of the others.'

J. H. KELLs.

University College, London.

JULIAN'S KNOWLEDGE OF LATIN

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, xiv. 1. 9, informs us that Gallus, Julian's half-brother, had a very good knowledge of Greek, 'Graeco sermone, cuius erat impendio gnarus', the implication being that his native language was Latin. Ammianus elsewhere tells us that Julian was able to speak some Latin, xvi. 5. 7 'aderat Latine quoque disserendi sufficiens sermo', and this is confirmed by Eutropius, x. 16. 3 'liberalibus disciplinis adprime eruditus, Graecia doctior atque adeo ut Latina eruditio nequaquam cum

Graeca scientia conveniret'. The implication here is that his native tongue was Greek. How does it happen that the sons of the same father have different mother-tongues?

Julius Constantius, their father, spoke Latin—we are explicitly told that his brother Constantine the Great was unable to speak Greek;¹ but in the course of his scholarly life at Toulouse and his subsequent residence at Corinth Julius

¹ Eusebius, *Vit. Const.* iii. 13.

certainly learned to converse easily in Greek.

His first wife, Galla, who bore him Gallus on his estate in Etruria, was, like her brothers,¹ a native of Rome. She died a couple of years after Gallus was born in A.D. 325/6, but we may be sure that the first language her son ever heard was Latin. Since it is unlikely that Julius Constantius after her death addressed his son in a foreign language, we may be sure that Gallus spoke little but Latin until his father's murder in A.D. 337, but in the course of his elementary education he will have learnt the rudiments of Greek. In the obscure period of his life immediately after 337 in Asia Minor and during his six years at Macellum (ending early in 348) there were many occasions on which it was impossible for him to use his native tongue, and to this time we must ascribe the comparative perfection of his Greek which Ammianus assures us he had acquired by A.D. 353.

Julian's mother, Basilina, the second wife of Julius Constantius, was a native Greek speaker. Her father was probably a native of Phoenicia,² and her tutor, the Scythian eunuch Mardonius, had been educated with the special purpose of instructing her in the poems of Hesiod and Homer³ and he certainly knew no Latin. Greek then will have been the language of Julian's first five years, but he will occasionally have heard his father speaking Latin. Bidez⁴ therefore exaggerates somewhat in saying that Julian did not begin to learn Latin until he went to Gaul in A.D. 355. But in his education at Constantinople, Nicomedia, Ephesus, and Athens he will have heard practically nothing but Greek, for Constantius did not want him to be educated in the language of the army and the administration.⁵ Yet

Latin speakers were among the philosophers and rhetors who flocked to hear him at Ephesus, so that he will not have heard Greek exclusively.⁶ Again, at Macellum, where all his instructors were Greek-speaking, he doubtless spoke some Latin to Gallus, although the latter had now so far progressed with his Greek that, despite his being far from studious by nature, he was delighted to hear his Greek oratory praised.⁷

When Julian went to Gaul in December, A.D. 355, all was changed, for Latin alone was spoken in the army and the administration. But Julian had not altogether forgotten the tongue of his father and his half-brother, and a few months after his arrival we hear of him frequently quoting the proverb: 'clitellae bovi sunt impositae; plane non est nostrum onus',⁸ a saying which he would scarcely have known if his study of Latin had only begun in the last days of December in the preceding year. It was here in Gaul that he acquired such proficiency in Latin as Ammianus attributes to him.

The Latin spoken in the frontier districts, however, does not seem to have been of a particularly good quality—at any rate, it was held in considerable contempt by the inhabitants of Aquitania (Sulpicius Severus, *Dial.* i. 27). Partly perhaps for this reason, but chiefly because of his profound attachment to Greek and Greek literature, Julian's letters written in these years to his friends in the East repeatedly complain that he must speak Latin—he is, he says, becoming 'barbarized'.⁹ Although he was reading and writing Greek in immense quantities—he was called a *litterio Graecus* at Constantius' court in the winter of 357/8¹⁰—he only

¹ Dessau, 1237, with Seeck, P.-W. iii. 1981, Zw. R. i. 1187.

² Seeck, P.-W. x. 93, s.v. 'Julianos' (32). His identity was established by Bidez, *Mélanges Paul Thomas*, pp. 57 ff., cf. his edition of Julian's *Lettres*, p. 71. 13 with crit. n. So Julian may have had Semitic blood in his veins.

³ Julian, *Misop.* 352 a-b.

⁴ *La Vie de l'Empereur Julien*, pp. 52 f.

⁵ Bidez, *Vie*, pp. 52 f.; cf. Eunapius, *Vit. Soph.*

p. 473. 50 ff. (p. 428 in the Loeb edition, ed. Wright).

⁶ Libanius, *Or.* xviii. 21. This is not to say, however, as Koch does, *Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire*, 1927, p. 125, n. 4, that Julian was already well enough educated in Latin at Constantinople: Koch presses this passage of Libanius unduly.

⁷ Libanius, *Or.* i. 97, cf. Greg. Naz. *Or.* iv. 30.

⁸ Ammianus xvi. 5. 10; cf. Cicero, *ad Att.* v. 15. 3, Quintilian, v. 11. 21.

⁹ *Ep.* 8, 9, cf. 13, ed. Bidez.

¹⁰ Ammianus xvii. 11. 1.

studied those Latin documents which it was politically expedient for him to read, viz. the published Latin speeches of Constantius.¹

Bearing in mind Julian's statement that he was becoming barbarized, i.e. that he was compelled to speak Latin continuously in Gaul, can we trace any Latin influence on his own Greek writings of this period? I have only been able to find one instance of a latinism in his Greek. In the *Epistle to the Athenians*, written when he had just left Gaul but was still in the Latin West at Nisch, he uses the phrase *οὐκ οἶδα οὐτως μοι στρατιώτου δόντος μανίκην*, where surely *οὐκ οἶδα οὐτως* is an unconscious recollection of the Latin use of *nescio quis*.²

After he became Emperor, the discussions in the Imperial *consistorium* were carried on in Greek when he was present, although it was a breach of custom for the Emperor to give his decisions in the *consistorium* in Greek.³

¹ Or. ii. 77 d. We do not hear that Constantius knew much Greek.

² *Ep. ad Ath.* 284 d. Is his use of *τριακοσιούτος* (wrongly changed to *τριακοστός* by Hertlein and Wright) in the same pamphlet, 276 a, an echo of the Latin use of *trecenti* to denote an indefinitely large number?

³ Gothofredus on *Cod. Theod.* xi. 39. 5; and see

Although several of Julian's laws are written in his own very individual style, there can be little doubt that he wrote them out in Greek and that they were then translated by the Imperial secretaries.⁴

Seeck⁵ rightly observes that Ammianus' cool description of Julian's Latin, 'Latine disserendi sufficiens sermo', in a passage which is otherwise highly panegyric, clearly indicates that Julian spoke extremely poor Latin.⁶ There is no reason to think that he ever read any literary work written by a Roman, apart from Constantius' speeches, and the references in his own writings to events of Roman history doubtless without exception are derived from Greek historians, especially Plutarch.

E. A. THOMPSON.

University of Nottingham.

his n. on vi. 24. 1 for the use of Greek in Julian's laws. Greek occasionally occurs in laws issued before Julian's time, e.g. viii. 15. 1.

⁴ Bidez, *Lettres*, preface, p. iii; Borries, P.-W. x. 83.

⁵ *Untergang*, iv. 458 f.
⁶ But Ammianus, who was himself at that time learning Latin with very considerable success, may not have been very charitable to his struggling fellow-student: Julian's speeches to the army, which must have been delivered in Latin, were always very moving, cf. *Hermathena*, lxii, forthcoming.

AN EMENDATION IN SAPPHO

BERGK 91 (Lobel, p. 49) γάμβρος εἰσέρχεται ἴσος Ἀρενι.

A simple cure for this unmetrical passage would be to read ἴσ(α) ἐρχε(αι), so easily corrupted into εἰσέρχεται, and delete ἴσος as a gloss. The

scansion would then run parallel to ἔφοι δὴ τὸ μέλαθρον of the first line of the fragment.

H. J. M. MILNE.

British Museum.

MARTIAL, ii. 14. 14-18 (THE WOULD-BE DINER OUT)

omnia cum fecit, sed renuente deo,
lotus ad Europes tepidae buxeta recurrit,
si quis ibi serum carpat amicus iter.
per te perque tuam, vector lascive, puellam,
ad cenam Selium tu, rogo, taure, voca.

The commentators have nothing very helpful; the idea that Selius was to be wrapped in a bundle of hay and thrown to a bull in the arena does not carry conviction. This passage is quite different from i. 43. 13, 14 which they quote, where Mancinus has set nothing before his guests but a boar, which he has not cut into:

ponatur tibi nullus aper post talia facta,
sed tu ponaris cui Charidemus apro

—a play on two meanings of *ponere*. It is said that Charidemus was exposed to a boar in the arena by order of Domitian.

In my teaching I have always explained the Selius passage by a reference to Mr. F.'s Aunt — 'Give him a meal of chaff.' It seems to me at least more plausible than other explanations offered. Selius has exhausted every effort to be invited to a good meal. 'He has a proud stomach. Give him a meal of chaff.' (*Little Dorrit*, Book II, chapter ix).

GERTRUDE HIRST.

Columbia University.

REVIEWS

TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE *ODYSSEY*

Marchinus H. A. L. H. VAN DER VALK:
Textual Criticism of the Odyssey. Pp.
 296. Leiden: Sijthoff, 1949. Paper,
 fl. 14.50.

DR. VAN DER VALK collected the material for this book during the late war, when he was acting as minister of the Netherlands Reformed Church at Wyngaarden in Holland, and he has been enabled to publish it by a grant from the *Legatum Hoeyffianum* controlled by the Royal Netherlands Academy of Sciences. It may be said at once that the Academy would have been hard put to it to find a worthier object for their assistance.

The author sets himself to examine the evidence for the text of the *Odyssey*, with special attention to the work of the ancient critics and above all the great Alexandrines, Zenodotus, Aristophanes, Rhianus, and Aristarchus. The examination is in two parts. The first (pp. 11-180) discusses the editions referred to by the Alexandrine critics (the *πολιτικά*, *ἀρχαία*, etc.), the influence of Didymus on our traditions about the Alexandrines, the value of the vulgate text compared with the papyri and *testimonia*, and the importance to be attached to the readings preferred by the Alexandrine critics, especially Aristarchus. Dr. V. concludes that the vulgate is very much more reliable than Ludwich and others have been inclined to believe, and that the readings ascribed to the great Alexandrines must be regarded as conjectures, and valued accordingly. He has no difficulty in showing that many of the Alexandrine critics' suggestions are due to ignorance of the epic diction, of the principles on which early epic is composed, and of the mentality of the archaic Greeks. In the second part (pp. 181-285) Dr. V. discusses the special problem of the 'athetized' lines, including those lines which Aristarchus defended against the strictures of his predecessors, and shows how most of the ancient *atheteses*, including those usually accepted by modern edi-

tors, are due to the same faults of comprehension on the part of the Alexandrines as he has already diagnosed in Part I. He also examines the relation of Homer to Hesiod and the Cycle, and the art of Homer, both in its virtues and its defects, and concludes that there is no good evidence, either internal or external, for large-scale interpolation in our vulgate text; the 'wild' papyri are to be regarded simply as freaks, which have had no ascertainable influence on the development of the text known to us from Byzantine manuscripts. The whole discussion is written in an English which, though not in all respects correct, is always clear and forcible and which reflects great credit on the author and on Dr. G. A. van Dongen, whose help with the translation is acknowledged in the preface. There are some additional notes (pp. 286-9) and full *indices locorum*. The book is handsomely produced and there are very few misprints, but some difficulty is caused by the transliteration of Greek words into roman type (italics or quotation marks would have helped); in one place where some lines of Russian are transliterated the Dutch phonetic values will create difficulties for the non-Dutch reader. (Considering how rare it still is to find classical scholars who can understand Russian, would it not have been better to provide a translation?)

It will be manifest that this is a book of the utmost importance to all concerned with the text of Homer; though the title seems to limit the book's relevance to the text of the *Odyssey*, Dr. V. has not failed to consider problems in the text of the *Iliad* whenever they are germane to his subject. Even those who disagree with Dr. V.'s conclusions will find themselves compelled to admire the thoroughness and the scholarly soundness of his methods, while those who, like the present reviewer, had already come to the conclusion that the vulgate text must be our stand-by and that

nothing can usefully or logically be said about Homer if the possibility of large-scale variation between the 'Homeric' and Byzantine texts is admitted, may perhaps regret that in some cases Dr. V. has not pressed his argument as far as he might have done: e.g. he accepts as genuine the version of *Il.* viii. 546-52 given by Plato at *Alc. II* 149 d-e (p. 87) and adopts without discussion the view that the long days enjoyed by the Laestrygonians do not prove knowledge (either in the poet or his sources) of conditions in the far North (p. 257), although some

corroboration of the view that the Laestrygonians are to be sought somewhere near the Arctic Circle may be found in the accompanying geographical description, which suggests acquaintance with a Norwegian *fjord*. But these are trivialities compared with the general soundness of Dr. V.'s work, which has a good claim to be regarded as the most important contribution to Homeric studies since Schadewaldt's *Iliasstudien* of 1938.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

ROMAN SATIRE

Otto WEINREICH: *Römische Satiren*.

Eingeleitet und zum grössten Teil neu übertragen. (Bibliothek der Alten Welt.) Pp. civ + 431; 8 plates, 10 text-figs. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1949. Cloth, 16.80 Sw. fr.

THIS volume is one of the first to be published in a new series—'Die Bibliothek der alten Welt'—which is to comprise translations of the principal works of Greek and Latin literature from Homer to St. Augustine, and whose object is to present in easily readable form to the modern public the thought of antiquity as a whole. The general editor of the series is Professor Karl Hönn.

In the present work we have Horace's *Satires*, Persius, six satires of Juvenal, Seneca's *Apocolocyntosis*, and about half of Petronius in translations partly old, partly new. These are the *fercula*, as it were, of this banquet. By way of *gustatio* we are offered select fragments from the satires of Ennius, Lucilius, and Varro, accompanied by a sort of running commentary. The whole is preceded by 100 pages of introduction on the history of the satire.

It is not for the present reviewer to judge the literary merit of the translations, some of which, such as Wieland's Horace and Blümner's Persius, are already well known to German-speaking readers. Of those that are published here for the first time, that of Petronius is the longest and offers the hardest test of the translator's scholarship and artistry. Professor Weinreich passes

with flying colours. He is always clear—which is more than can be said of his original—he avoids the insidious temptation to modernize, and he surmounts the numerous cruces with commendable resourcefulness. His text seems mainly to be that of Bücheler-Heraeus, but he is not bound by it. His Juvenal, too, is vigorous and accurate. But German hexameters always seem somewhat stilted and unspontaneous. Wieland, who was a poet in his own right, knew better than to attempt to reproduce in his native tongue the metre of Horace's *Satires*.

The fifty pages devoted to Ennius, Lucilius, and Varro are perhaps the least satisfactory of the whole book. Fragments, even when served with Weinreich's sauce, are not the tastiest of morsels. And there is so much uncertainty about the reconstruction of some of these satires that a translator must either enter into complex technical arguments or expound as dogma what is only one view among many.

The introduction gives a fair picture of what is known of the origin and history of Roman satire. On the vexed question of dramatic *satura* W. reacts against the scepticism of Leo, and agrees with many later writers in seeing in Livy vii. 2 a core of fact. He rightly rejects Kerenyi's theory that *satura* originated in the cult of Dionysus (the word being cognate with *σάτυρος*), as well as Altheim's suggestion that it grew out of the worship of Ceres (*lanx satura*

= *κυκεών*; *Fescennina licentia* = *ἱαμβος*). The associations of *satura*, W. maintains, are primarily culinary; the point of resemblance between the early satire and the *lanx satura* was merely that both were a kind of salad or pot-pourri, and beyond that we cannot go with certainty.

The development of this *mélange* by Ennius, Lucilius, Varro, Horace, Persius, Seneca, Petronius, and Juvenal is briefly and clearly sketched, and the strong Greek influence underlying the Menippean satire is not over-estimated. The changing social background against which these men worked is not sufficiently explained, and even their personal position in the society of their time is not always made clear: for instance, in the section on Lucilius there is no mention of the Scipionic circle. The introduction concludes with sixteen pages on 'Ausklang und Nachklänge'. These are fascinating pages: but the fact that the book is written primarily for the Swiss public hardly seems to excuse the absence from them of the names of Dryden, Pope, Swift, and Johnson.

'Alles Antiquarische', says the introduction to the whole series, 'wird ferngehalten.' In general W. wears his erudition lightly, though it would evidently be vain to attempt to discuss the origin and history of a literary form without introducing much that an unkind critic could damn as *antiquarisch*. Why, then, are we given every now and then a reference such as 'Heraeus, Rhein. Mus. 79. 264 ff.' or 'Hausrath, RE 19. 1487'?

There are curious statements in the introduction, some of which the re-

viewer would like to think the result of oversight, e.g.: p. xxxvii: 'Wir besitzen von diesem aus Südfrankreich stammenden Dichter (M. Terentius Varro Atacinus) die Übersetzung des Argonautenepos von Apollonios dem Rhodier.' The praenomen should be Publius, and the work is lost, save for a few lines. p. lv: it is a little disingenuous to say of Persius that, as his praenomen Aules shows, he clung to the Etruscan traditions of his family. Was his praenomen in fact Aules? p. lx: the present stage of the inquiry is not adequately represented by merely dismissing the additional verses in the Bodleian manuscript of Juvenal as interpolations. p. lxx: Seneca's 'Spanish blood' will not do as an explanation of what is good or bad in him. p. lxxxii: the manuscripts of Petronius do not attribute the whole surviving portion of the *Satyricon* to books xiv and xv. p. xciii: it was Theodoric the Great, and not Theodosius, who put Boethius to death in 524.

The paper and typography are of the high quality which we associate with Swiss publications, and the book is pleasingly illustrated.

If *Römische Satiren* is to be typical of the new series, then we extend a cordial welcome to the 'Bibliothek der alten Welt', and felicitate Swiss readers on having a really representative selection of the classics available in scholarly and graceful translations, with introductions representing the state of modern scholarship. But more care should be taken over proof-reading in the future.

ROBERT BROWNING.

University College, London.

THE BUDÉ QUINTUS CURTIUS

QUINTE-CURCE: *Histoires*. Texte établi et traduit par H. Bardon. Tome I (livres III-VI), pp. xxi+212; Tome II (livres VII-X), pp. 213-445. (Collection Budé.) Paris, Les Belles Lettres, 1947 and 1948. Paper, 1000 fr.

M. BARDON allocates three and a half pages of his brief Introduction to an excellent summary discussion of the

date and merits, literary and historical, of Q. Curtius. Those desiring information on a scale more commensurate with a text of over 400 pages must refer to his articles in *Les Études classiques* (1947). By contrast, those interested in textual matters are offered nine pages of detail on the manuscripts, establishment of text, and *apparatus*. The short

list of principal editions (pp. xviii-xix) should include at least that of Laver (*passim* in *apparatus*); it should not style the editor of the Brunswick edition of 1849 'A.-W. Zumpt'. Two German and three French translators are mentioned. No *Supplementa* are printed.

B. has used the photographic copies of P and B and also of M (Parisinus 5717), of which he has made a full recension, classing it with B, F, L, and V. He is thus able to correct slightly some readings attributed to P and B, and from M to confirm certain readings (usually fairly clear) adopted by early editors, e.g. iii. 13. 11 *incredibili* P^cB^cM (Laver); v. 1. 14 *coeunt* B^cM (Laver); v. 1. 31 *turrium* M (Laver); v. 8. 13 (*possit*) *posit* P^cB^cM; vi. 2. 15 *percrebruit* M (Zarotus); vii. 2. 33 *et* [*ad*] *omnia* B^cM (Laver)—or found in the *Interpolati*, as vi. 11. 30 *expers sum* M (Flor. G). The text is mainly conservative, and B. himself makes some sixty suggestions (as against Hedicke's 380 in 1908). Many are slight. Some raise doubts, e.g. iii. 2. 7 *haerebant*; iii. 12. 21 *reginas*; iv. 10. 9 *ingressus*; vii. 5. 25 *se inseculos, cuius*; ix. 3. 19 *e regia erigique* (a combination of *codd.* and Froben inconsistent with the punctuation adopted). Certain longer changes, where palaeographical difficulties are most obvious, should have been discussed in notes such as those given to other readings (pp. 92, 118, 119, 210, 338, 416, etc.) Not all readings marked *ego* are original: e.g. vi. 4. 7 *demissi* was made by Zumpt, x. 1. 26 *perquam* by Heinsius, and ix. 4. 10 *coetu* goes back to early editions.

The *apparatus* is fuller than many may expect, or require, in this edition. Interchange, for example, of *t* and *c*, *e* and *ae* or *oe*, *p* and *b*, and the omissions of *h*, are painstakingly recorded. Such *minutiae* could have been covered by some introductory remarks, with reference to Hedicke's *editio maior* of 1908. Even so, one often lacks information: e.g. on iii. 2. 5 *equitatum*; iii. 3. 6 *solet*; iv. 11. 20 *suorum*; v. 9. 8 *gratia*; viii. 14. 31 *multo*; ix. 2. 20 *pauco quoque incommode*; ix. 9. 10 *intumescere*. Of inaccuracies I quote a few instances: iii. 7. 12 '*maioribus Acidalius, Hedicke*'—

but H. (1908) printed *moribus* (*codd.*) *suis*: iii. 8. 17 'in maritimas *Vogel*'—so Vindelin (as *Vogel* says) and others; iii. 13. 3 '*cui traderet, etc. Vogel, Dosson*' is the text suggested in Zumpt's note, and '*qui quae, etc. Prohasel, Hedicke*' should be *cui quae*; iv. 10. 4 '*p. [iubet] Zumpt*' is much earlier, as Z. says; iv. 11. 2 '*tua add. Hedicke*'—but to *iustitia*, not to *continentia*, as here printed; v. 1. 33 '*frugiferaque Halm, edd.*' should be *frugiferaeque* (the reading, incidentally, of Flor. G); vi. 5. 11 '*expedita Dosson*' is Faber's suggestion, '*delecta Zumpt*' is misleading, since Z. printed *invicta* (*codd.*), though attracted by his own *delecta* as well as Müttzell's *valida*; vi. 6. 28 '*iam inarserat Vogel*' is from Sebisius *apud* Freinsheim; vi. 9. 36 '*odio Vogel*'—so Aldus and others; vi. 11. 28 '*uenit Vogel, Dosson*'—so Modius (from Palmer, as *Vogel* says); vi. 11. 33 (p. 210, n. 1)—Hedicke (1908) printed *cui patrem afuisse*, not *patrem expertem*; ix. 9. 12 *probabant* was *Vogel's* text, Hedicke (1908) printed *prohibebant*, as here. At vi. 7. 32 *purgari* for '*codd.*' read '*edd.*'; at viii. 10. 30 *cumulis* and viii. 12. 9 *spectasse* for '*edd.*' read '*codd.*'.

In the translation, sometimes more, sometimes less variety appears than in the Latin, e.g. '*continent*', '*terre ferme*' (pp. 51-2), '*forêt*', '*bois*', '*oasis*' (*ne-mus*) (*ter*) (p. 74), '*sort*' (*bis*) (pp. 250-1), '*vaste*' (*bis*) (p. 283). There are errors, e.g. iv. 1. 28 '*Satacès*', iv. 3. 23 *Saturno*, '*Neptune*', iv. 12. 4 *ducentis*, '*trois cents*' (other wrong numerals, v. 1. 27; vii. 3. 4; ix. 4. 14), iv. 15. 21 *calcaribus subditis*, '*à bride abattue*'; viii. 6. 28-9 *reos* '*conjurés*', *coniuratos* '*accusés*', viii. 14. 3 *sagittarios* omitted; ix. 8. 1 *equites* '*chevaux*'; and, rarely, inadequacies, as iv. 4. 4 '*disparaissant sous les flots*', iv. 16. 14 '*pour capter un peau d'eau cachée*'; vi. 4. 5 '*il disparaît ainsi*'; vii. 5. 20 '*tout semblait permis*'. The editor's version '*cherche à être précise et à donner, dans la mesure du possible, un équivalent du style de Q.-C.*'—no light claim, since he rates high his author's literary quality (p. ix)—but one which seems to me (*citra mare nato*) to be not ill founded.

Misprints in the text include iii. 2. 15 *cubicule*, iii. 3. 6 *forman*; p. 58 *LIRER*; iv. 7. 21 *ueteres*, iv. 15. 23 *propre*; p. 155 transposed numbers at head; vii. 11. 24 *inuene*s; and in the translation, p. 26 chapter number; iv. 1. 33 'punititon'; p. 69 ends of lines 8 and 15. Some false references appear in the footnotes, the most violent being Virg. *Georg.* 4. 2. 17. 8 (p. 108, 1) and Tite-Live 17. 10. 7 (p. 114, 1); on p. 138 a wrongly-numbered note refers to Cic. *Part. Or.* 17. 57 but actually quotes a similar passage from *ad Herenn.* ii. 31. 50, supported by a wrong reference to *Inv.* 1. 109 (cf. p. 341 n. 1, for confusion between *manus* in Cic. *N.D.* ii. 120 and 123).

Proper names are a notorious difficulty in Q. Curtius, and a partial check of the Index has shown many errors and

some omissions, including Issos. Some forms are fluid, e.g. iii. 1. 19 and iv. 5. 14, iv. 5. 15 and 17 (in translation); v. 1. 43 'Ménès' (*Menetes*, text and Index); vii. 10. 11 'Ménidas' (*Maenidas*) with reference to iv. 15. 12 'Ménidas' (cf. 16. 32) (*Menidas*)—which the Index separates; p. 418 ('Pithon', 'Python'). p. 98 n. 3 contradicts the Index and p. 99 n. 4 is proved erroneous by the *apparatus*.

Both volumes need careful revision in detail. But Quintus Curtius is a very welcome addition to the Budé series, and with the recent Loeb edition may give hope for a revival of interest in an author who has lately suffered unmerited neglect.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

THE LETTERS OF ST. JEROME

Saint Jérôme: *Lettres*, Texte établi et traduit par Jérôme LABOURT. Tome I (i-xxii). (Collection Budé.) Pp. lxxvii + 170 (double). Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1949. Paper, 500 fr.

Few works were so much read and copied in the Middle Ages as the letters of St. Jerome. Hence they survive in a very large number of manuscripts, dating from the sixth century to the sixteenth, and containing from I to III of the 154 letters forming the corpus. Until the present century it was impracticable to attempt to establish the text of the letters upon collation of all the evidence. Fortunately the manuscripts are good, and Jerome suffered less than most of the Latin Fathers from the lack of a scientific text. With the materials at his disposal—and with unerring scholarship—Domenico Vallarsi in the eighteenth century produced an excellent text,¹ which became the 'vulgate', and was reprinted by Migne.

Early in the present century Isidor Hilberg published a new edition of the letters,² based upon collations of 139

manuscripts. However, owing to the loss of his papers during the first World War, Hilberg was unable to publish the promised prolegomena, in which he would doubtless have spoken of the relations of the manuscripts; and so his great work remains unfinished, and indeed unfinishable.

Father Labourt's Budé text, of which this is the first volume, comprising letters 1-22, is wholly built upon Hilberg's edition, from which, as he says, he only departs when a variant rejected by H. seems to him more attractive. A check of 40 pages revealed 15 divergences from H.'s text. In particular, L. rejects some of H.'s conjectures designed to harmonize Jerome's Biblical quotations: e.g. in the quotation of Isaiah vi. 6-7 in *ep.* 18A. 14, where the manuscripts read *sumpserat* or *tulerat*, H. imported the reading *acceperat* from the earlier quotation of the same passage at the beginning of the letter: L. wisely prints *tulerat*, the reading of the majority of the manuscripts. In the whole volume, L. prints only two conjectures of his own: at *ep.* 21. 6, where he has *haud iniustum* in the text, and at *ep.* 1. 12 (p. 7, l. 25), where he makes a suggestion in the apparatus.

At the same time L. has reduced H.'s

¹ Two editions, the first published at Verona, 1734-42, the second, which Migne reprinted in 1864, at Venice, 1766-72.

² Volumes liv-lvi of the *C.S.E.L.*, Vienna and Leipzig, 1910, 1912, and 1918.

unwieldy *apparatus criticus*—even after vigorous pruning by Engelbrecht it still notes 60,000 to 65,000 variant readings—to the compass of four or five lines per page. This difficult task has not always been accomplished without error. For example in *ep.* 18B. 2 (p. 75, l. 24), where L. prints 'manum' in the text, his apparatus has 'manus B'; reference to H. shows that 'manus' is the reading of BS. L.'s eye has slipped down to the next line in H.'s apparatus, where 'manus B' appears, but in quite a different connexion. Again in § 5 of the same letter (p. 77, l. 8), where H. prints in his apparatus 'cogitatione tranquillitatem *codd. prae-ter* BS', L. miscopies it as 'cogitatione tranquillitatis *codd. prae-ter* BS'. In *ep.* 21 I have noted four such oversights (p. 89, l. 20; p. 91, l. 3; p. 99, l. 10 and l. 19), as well as two passages where L.'s printer seems to have let him down (p. 90, l. 25; p. 94, l. 5).

Apart from these trifling inaccuracies, two more serious kinds of error have crept in during the abbreviation. H.'s apparatus is what the Germans call 'negativ', i.e. he quotes the authority only for readings not adopted in the text. Now L.'s apparatus is of the same nature, but sometimes he forgets that a 'negative' apparatus must be exhaustive. Thus in *ep.* 18A. 12 (p. 67, l. 24) his text reads 'habitem' and his apparatus has 'habitat F2DS'. From this one is entitled to infer that the other manuscripts LWB read 'habitem'; but B actually reads 'habitabat'. Again in *ep.* 22. 25 (p. 136, l. 23) his text has 'tremefacta' and his apparatus 'ex-

pergefacta 2D'; but Φ actually reads 'extrema facta'.

Secondly, when L. departs from H.'s text, he sometimes forgets to make a corresponding change in the apparatus. Thus the final word of *ep.* 18B is in H.'s text 'legimus', and his apparatus has 'legerimus S, legamus *Bp.c.m2s*', implying that 'legimus' is the reading of FL2D, the remaining manuscripts. L. prints 'legamus' in his text and copies H.'s apparatus, thus suppressing the reading of the majority of the manuscripts.

L.'s translation is scholarly and elegant—no easy task with the most learned of the Fathers—and silently clears up many an obscurity of interpretation. For some reason he does not divide his text into H.'s numbered sections, but only into H.'s—originally Vallarsi's—paragraphs, some of which are four or five pages long.

In thirty-five pages of the introduction he gives a sympathetic and accurate treatment of the life and work of Jerome and his friends, touching on most of the disputed questions, and giving references to the relevant literature. The remainder of the introduction is devoted to such an account of the history of the text as is possible, and to a brief note on the translation.

For all ordinary purposes this edition of Jerome's letters is admirable. But the reader who seeks information on textual questions must still turn to Hilberg.

ROBERT BROWNING.

University College, London.

GREEK CULTURE IN THE WEST FROM MACROBIUS TO CASSIODORUS

Pierre COURCELLE: *Les Lettres grecques en Occident de Macrobe à Cassiodore*. 2me édition. (Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d'Athènes et de Rome, fasc. 159.) Pp. xvi + 440. Paris: de Boccard, 1948. Paper.

THIS is a work of remarkable erudition, which, as a thorough and systematic survey of the extent of the Greek culture of the West from the fourth to the sixth century, breaks much new ground. Pro-

fessor Courcelle has chosen as his field the vitally important period which includes the last pagan revival under Symmachus and his friends, Jerome and Augustine among the Christian authors, the literary renaissance in Gaul in the time of Sidonius Apollinarius, the rise of Western monasticism, and the revival of letters in Theodoric's Italy. His work matches in interest and learning the importance of his subject, and

it is of great value both to the classicist and to the patristic student.

For the former the most valuable pages will be those in which the sources of Western Neoplatonism are discussed, and the channels are traced by which Plato's thought, so far as it was understood, was handed down to the last generation of pagan scholars. The latter will find that the author has raised, and to some extent provided an answer to, the fundamentally important question how far ignorance of Greek on the part of Latin Churchmen affected the history of Christian thought and promoted the drifting apart of East and West. Here there emerge those far-reaching problems for the theologian which have been followed up by G. Bardy in his *La Question des Langues dans l'Église ancienne*. The fact, well established by Professor Courcelle, that for the most part the Latin philosophers of the period, pagan and Christian alike, depended for their acquaintance with Greek literature upon 'reader's' digests', and that Western theologians were to a surprising degree ignorant of the work of their Greek-speaking fellow Christians, is of the highest importance for our understanding of the classical culture of the late Empire and of the development of theology.

This book suggests many questions which are beyond its own scope, such as, for example, the underlying technical problems of the nature of the principles upon which the ancient translator performed his work, of the extent to which the words of one language were held to have a single fixed equivalent in another (as the history of Christian doctrinal controversy suggests), and of the character of the dictionaries available to the ancient scholar.

An interesting chapter on the always attractive theme of Macrobius and his circle contains some interesting suggestions and discoveries. The source of Praetextatus' discourse (Macrobius *Sat.* i. 17-23) on the names of the gods and their identification with the sun is traced, by means of a comparison with Servius (ad *Ecl.* 5. 66), to Porphyry. A good deal of light is thrown on the

character of Neoplatonism among this group; its tenets are held to be absolutely true, and no attempt is made either to differentiate between the doctrine of Plotinus and that of Porphyry, or between their theories and those of Plato. Macrobius' use of Porphyry is typical of his age. That he knew and interpreted Plotinus largely through the medium of Porphyry emerges from the interesting demonstration (arrived at by a comparison of *In Somn. Scip.* i. 13, 15 with Aug. *Civ. Dei*, 10. 29, 30) of the correctness of Cumont's view that Macrobius derived his argument against suicide from Plotinus by way of the *De Regressu* of Porphyry.

A valuable chapter on the extent of Jerome's acquaintance with Greek literature reveals that, for all his parade of learning, his actual knowledge of secular Greek authors was largely confined to Latin translations, summaries, and borrowings at second hand from Christian writers. No doubt his exegetical and ascetical interests were too strong to permit him to pursue classical studies beyond the point to which they might be held to contribute to the furtherance of those interests. Such was, at any rate, the motive with which he read Porphyry, studying the latter's work against the Christians for apologetic purposes, and plagiarizing the *De Abstinencia* to support his ascetical theology. It may be the case that he knew the former through the refutations published by Methodius, Apollinarius, and others; but it is doubtful whether, as Professor Courcelle holds, the original was unobtainable in Jerome's day owing to its condemnation by Constantine; the letter given in Socrates (i. 9) is one of the most dubious Constantinian documents, and it was probably not until the reign of Theodosius II (in 448) that action was taken to suppress Porphyry's book. Jerome may well have known some of Philo's work at first hand, but his mention of Philo's account of the 'Essenes' does not in itself bear this out, as Courcelle seems to suggest; Jerome may have known of it only through Eusebius.

The Biblical student will be interested

to learn that Jerome's theory that the number of fish in the miraculous draught (John xxi. 11) corresponds to the 153 species of fish in existence was derived, not from Oppian, whom, with a parade of rather bogus erudition, Jerome cites at this point (*P.L.* xxv. 474 c), but from an unknown Christian commentator.

In two important chapters on the Hellenism of Augustine and his contemporaries the author brings out the influence on Augustine of Manlius Theodorus, who introduced him to a type of Neoplatonism which, as the example of both Augustine and Aponius was to prove, could fairly easily be brought into harmony with Christianity; he also shows that the chief centre of Greek studies in the West at the end of the fourth century was the circle of Jerome and his companions, and that by the time of Leo the influence of Hellenic culture had waned so rapidly that the leaders of the Roman Church could not handle the Greek language with any ease—a factor of great importance for the history of theology.

An interesting and convincing account is given of Augustine's somewhat slow progress in the Greek tongue, the decisive influence of the Neoplatonists on his thought, and his slight acquaintance with the Greek Fathers.

Professor Courcelle's survey of Greek culture in fifth-century Gaul begins suitably with a recognition of the immense importance of Evagrius Ponticus as the principal channel by which the asceticism and mysticism of the Eastern monks flowed into the Western monastic movement of Cassian and the school of Lerins.

As against Bömer in *Der lateinische Neuplatonismus*, it is argued convincingly that the source of Claudianus Mamertus' *De statu animae* is primarily Porphyry's *De regressu*, read, not in the translation of Victorinus, as it was by Augustine, but in the original. In the valuable later chapters on the renaissance under Theodoric there is a useful discussion of Boethius' acquaintance with the Neoplatonists, and particularly with Porphyry and Ammonius, through whom he derives his knowledge of the *Timaeus*. The attempt to connect Boethius with the philosophical schools of Alexandria by postulating an identification of his father with the Boetios mentioned by Zacharias of Mitylene as prefect of Egypt between 475 and 477 is historically more dubious.

This is perhaps a work whose chief value lies in the field of historical and patristic study; but the concluding chapter on the difficult question of the manuscripts of Vivarium is also of considerable interest to the classicist. The good bibliography of the first edition has received a useful supplement.

Among small points noted, it is perhaps worth remarking that the 'homily of Basil' (13, on Baptism) which Augustine attributed to Chrysostom (*Iul.* 2. 6. 17) is generally ascribed to Severian of Gabala, that the impression is given (p. 213) that the spurious fourth oration against the Arians is genuinely Athanasian, and that the very doubtful possibility is entertained, without any discussion of the evidence, that Rutilius Namatianus was a Christian.

G. W. H. LAMPE.

St. John's College, Oxford.

GEOGRAPHY AND HISTORY

M. CARY: *The Geographic Background of Greek and Roman History*. Pp. viii + 331; 33 maps. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 30s. net.

It goes without saying that a book on this subject by Dr. Cary will be of the utmost value both to historians and to geographers. The criticisms which must be made arise principally from the scale of the work. After 36 promising pages of

introduction we are given 66 pages on Greece with its islands and 48 on Italy and Sicily: the periphery, including every country which the Greeks and Romans trod from Ireland to the Indus, is fitted into the remaining half. No one will need to be told that on the central areas Dr. Cary's judgement and descriptive power have illuminated many places which seemed familiar, among which

Thessaly and Central Greece, Campania, Tarentum, and Brundisium deserve special mention. But elsewhere the treatment is regrettably cramped. Dr. Cary can only give us more of his careful studies on the countries east of Augustus' empire by cutting Syria, with Palestine and the adjoining kingdoms, to a mere nine pages, in which one misses any systematic inquiry into the routes between Mesopotamia and the Roman Empire and the accompanying frontier problems. More serious, certain important questions have had to be mentioned without even a brief indication of the evidence bearing on them, such as malaria (p. 25), the origins of wheat (p. 167), or population statistics (pp. 237, 247, 270), or worse still without an adequate bibliography, for instance the Oxus and Caspian trade routes (pp. 177, 199), Italian *latifundia* (pp. 33-4), or immigration into Africa (p. 222).

Perhaps the country on which this brevity is most tantalizing is Spain, where the emphasis is chiefly on its 'comparative isolation from the rest of Europe'. That the eastern seaboard remained undeveloped until 'Rome provided the attraction of an inexhaustible market' (p. 239) is a statement which raises more questions than it solves, and to some the main paradox about the Iberian peninsula will remain the persistence of its invaders by both land and sea and the early appreciation of its wealth. As to Roman times, the size of its towns and population must remain obscure in the present state of the evidence, but what passed for 'urbanization' was not, of course, confined to Baetica, and some speculation about what this urbanization involved would have been valuable. On the Gauls there is a wholly admirable section. An interesting suggestion is that the wine exported by Roman merchants to Comata before the northern vineyards started (cf. Diodorus, v. 26; Caes. *B.G.* ii. 15. 4) was the Narbonese concoction specially doctored for the unsophisticated (Pliny, *N.H.* xiv. 68), though this is not the natural meaning of the texts or of the supposed concern of the Italians for their own exports (Cic. *De Rep.* iii. 26).

More puzzling is the view that the Po valley is geographically Gallic rather than Italian (p. 103), for the 'trans-Alpine neighbour' which it resembles in climate is surely nothing farther north than Narbonensis, and the resemblance is a fact about Provence more than about north Italy; for the familiar misquotation which makes the Cisalpina *provincia verius quam Italia* is applicable only to a limited period of Roman history. That Piedmont owed its development to Rome's interest in the Alpine passes (p. 117) is clearly right; but the Ligurians would hardly have agreed that this interest started as late as c. 120 B.C., nor does the foundation of Eporodia show that Rome's principal line of communications was *already* the Little St. Bernard any more than current interest in Iceland shows that the majority of travellers have hitherto crossed the Atlantic that way. The section on the Danube makes Octavian conquer Bosnia in 35-34 B.C. without reference to the views of R. Syme in *J.R.S.* xxiii (1933), p. 66, and Cn. Lentulus cross the Haemus to secure the Danube in 18 B.C., the year of his consulate, surely an improbable date and too limited a view of the scope of his operations. In general, too, Roman frontier policy, in Germany as well as on the Danube, seems to be viewed too much in terms of fixed lines, with a consequent excessive preference for rivers; and it is not clear why the Elbe frontier which Augustus is alleged to have planned gains merit from being a 'clear diagonal cut' across Europe (p. 274; cf. p. 289).

One great virtue of this book is its avoidance of the temptation to regard climate and geography as an all-sufficient explanation of history. The question, however, arises, and is faced, why it was precisely these countries, and no others, into which the Greeks and Romans penetrated. Clearly in essence the Graeco-Roman world was a Mediterranean world, but from time to time it threw out protecting bastions. These must never be too far from the point which political history had established as the centre, a principle which lies

behind most of Rome's Eastern policy; but what dictated the varying limits of advance in Europe? Among other factors Dr. Cary favours a Graeco-Roman distaste for steppes, explaining thereby the limited penetration of Africa and Rome's hesitation to advance beyond the Danube or even into the Dobrogea country. But these two instances do not take us very far, especially as more important strategic motives can be seen on the Danube, where Rome by no means shirked the duty of protecting the Greek Pontic cities when this was possible, even in Augustus' day. The question depends partly on precise evidence of the way ancient geographers viewed things, a matter which Dr. Cary has treated elsewhere but for which there was little room in this book. But so far as Roman frontiers depended on the legacy of Caesar, they may not have been drawn wholly in accordance with strict science.

The maps are disappointing for a work at this price. The contours do little to show the real nature of the communicating passes. Certain coun-

tries, such as Spain and Gaul, are divided awkwardly between two opposing pages; and the only folding map, which shows the whole Mediterranean basin with but twenty names and two forms of shading (which are unexplained by any key), is useless to anyone who has seen that region drawn before. The map on p. 114 (which contains the word *Tricinus*) depicts modern, not ancient, Venetia, and thus fails to explain Ravenna, which, though this is not mentioned in the text, was joined to the Po by a canal. On p. 226 Cape Bon is wrongly marked, and in the text at p. 225 is called the Hermaean Promontory instead of *καλὴ ἀκτὴ* (as rightly on p. 146). Among some small errors of proof-reading in the text one which might mislead is at p. 277: we are told that Strabo makes no mention of Styrian gold, when the passage cited on this subject from Polybius is itself a citation from Strabo (p. 208). But it is a most stimulating book, though it is a pity it could not be longer.

G. E. F. CHILVER.

Queen's College, Oxford.

ATHENIAN TRIBUTE LISTS

B. D. MERITT, H. T. WADE-GERY, M. F. MCGREGOR: *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, Volume II. Pp. 125; 16 plates of photographs. Princeton, N.J.: American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1949. Cloth, \$10.

WHEN the first volume of *A.T.L.* was published in 1939 it was intended that the second and concluding volume should appear within a few years. As a result of the war it was not until 1947 that the three authors were able to work continuously together again. The longer interval has modified their plan. Before publishing conclusions they have wisely issued this further volume of source material.

Volume ii corrects and supplements volume i, taking account of criticisms and adding much new material. In a short first chapter the principles adopted for restoration of the Quota Lists, implicit in vol. i, are explicitly stated and defended. In chapter ii the earlier

texts of the epigraphic documents are revised, their bibliography brought up to date, and new documents added.

Among the comparatively few changes in the Quota Lists we note the revision of the total of silver recorded in the postscript of List 1 from $[\overline{\Gamma}X]XX \dots$ to $[\overline{\Gamma}T]XX$; the attractive restoration of *Τελεμιστοὶ καὶ Λυκιοὶ* in Lists 3 and 4; the change in the Eretrian quota of List 7 (448/7) from $[HH]H$ to $[\overline{\Gamma}]H$. The anomalous quota of Argilus in List 1, $X\overline{\Gamma}^2$, is explained as a cutter's error for $H\overline{\Gamma}^2$: this is a drastic solution for which it is hard to find a satisfactory parallel in the lists, but the reference to Argilus in the Peace of Nicias (Thuc. v. 18. 5) is difficult to reconcile with the quota on the stone. Less violent is the interesting suggestion that in List 20 (435/4) the quotas of Potidaea and Scione have been inadvertently transposed. In one case the second volume is less satisfactory than the first. List 33, which was

redated by Meritt to 418/17 in *A.J.P.* lxii (1941), p. 10, is now replaced in its position in vol. i as the list for 422/1; but, by a slip, the archon for 418/17 has been retained in the prescript and one of the main difficulties of the earlier dating has been obscured by the omission of two vacant spaces at the end of l. 2 (which has 48 letters against a normal 50). On this dating and on the other changes in the lists judgement must be suspended; discussion is reserved for the final volume.

Of the Assessment documents the decree of A 9 is substantially improved with many new restorations. A 10 is now dated to 422/1 instead of 421, which presumably implies an assessment in 422, a change of doctrine. More doubtful is the restoration of the Hellespontine total as 95+ talents with two vacant spaces before the numeral. In A 9, however, there is only one vacant space before the numeral, suggesting a total in A 10 of 195+ talents. We look forward to discussion on this point.

The inscriptions (the D series) printed in vol. i have been revised and the series extended from 9 to 25 entries. We now have a systematic study of the various fragments of the Coinage Decree which, in addition to several minor changes, yields a much improved version of the last section of the large fragment from Syme. The identification, however, of the Coinage Decree with the Decree of Clearchus, as stated, seems to involve a questionable interpretation of the clause added to the Bouleutic oath [τιμωρήσομαι καὶ ζημιώσω κατὰ τὸ πρότερον ψήφισμα ὃ Κλέαρχ[ος εἶπε]. 'It is just possible that Klearchos, in phrasing the oath, called his own decree πρότερον, because for the future swearer the decree would be "earlier" than his oath.' For such a usage there is surely no parallel? The alternative suggestion 'that the letter read by Baumeister as P was really N; this would allow the restoration [γενόμε]νον' is a dangerous expedient and provides an unlikely text. It still seems preferable to hold that an earlier decree is here referred to; though the hypothesis that Clearchus also moved the Coinage Decree is not un-

likely. The inclusion of improved texts for the Athenian regulations for Erythrae, Miletus, Colophon, (but surely Ἀθηνῶν μεδὲ ὅσ[ες] in l. 14 is less convincing than the reference to Athena Medeoussa in *I.G.* i²), Eretria, Chalcis, Samos, Mitylene is a further extremely valuable addition to the first volume. The Erythrae text (D 10) in particular marks a great advance. Some of the cardinal points of reconstruction (including the grounds for associating *I.G.* i². 11 and 12/13a with Fauvel's lost copy, *I.G.* i². 10) have been argued elsewhere, but many further new restorations are given without comment. It is very doubtful whether the scale of vol. iii will allow a full discussion and we may hope that a substantial commentary will be published separately. The Milesian regulations (D 11) are pruned of extravagances; the Athenian oath to Samos (D 18) is convincingly restored; and the tentative reconstruction of the decree concerning Mitylene (D 22) gives at any rate coherent sense to the document. The reservation of discussion of the texts here published might obscure the extent of the advance made. Judgement on controversial restorations must await the defence in the final volume, but many of the changes will be at once accepted and the total gain is impressive.

Chapter iii gives additions and corrections to the Register (Ἐρόδιοι are now equated with Χεδρώλιοι; Ἀλινδῆς disappear): chapter iv does the same for the Gazetteer, though discussion of controversial sites is postponed. In chapter v the testimonia are increased by more than 100 new passages (T₃ has been inadvertently omitted and the second 3a should be 3b), and the much more complete literary documentation of tribute problems strengthens this section considerably.

Chapter vi gives a useful index to amounts of tribute. This shows the general pattern of assessment (common and uncommon amounts stand out clearly) but it should be borne in mind that a state is indexed under as many amounts as its changing assessment requires. In chapter vii the roster of

hellenotamiai is brought up to date. Last, and by no means least, 16 plates of photographs whose excellence we have come, most unfairly, to take for granted.

This volume maintains the standard of its predecessor, high praise. Though in comparison slight, it contains a

wealth of new material for epigraphist and historian, and is a fitting appetizer for the grand climax of the work.

The volume is dedicated to the printers, a generous tribute, handsomely deserved.

RUSSELL MEIGGS.

Balliol College, Oxford.

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS OF THE GREEK CITY-STATES

Victor MARTIN: *La Vie internationale dans la Grèce des Cités* (VI^e-IV^e s. av. J.-C.). (Publications de l'Institut Universitaire de Hautes Études Internationales, no. 21.) Pp. xii+633. Geneva: Georg, 1940. Paper.

THIS publication by the Graduate Institute of International Studies is based on the programme of five conferences held in 1934 and is intended for a wide public which is not necessarily acquainted with ancient history. To this fact one may attribute the unusual length of the book. For the author is always at pains to narrate the history of those events which are essential to the picture; further, as the matter is treated under the different headings of cities, alliances, imperialism, treaties of peace, and arbitration, we find the opening phase of the Peloponnesian War recurring in each chapter and, what is more, receiving a description in each case. Nor do the six hundred pages of this book cover the entire field for the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. The concepts of *κοινή εἰρήνη* and of *ὁμόνοια* and the attempts to achieve collective security, as in *I.G.* iv. 556, are deferred for subsequent consideration (p. 576). This is to be regretted, because these concepts are more intelligible to a modern audience and more apposite to modern problems. Yet, when these comments have been made, it should be acknowledged that Professor Martin has produced a most thorough and important study of Greek international relations, more particularly in the fifth century B.C., and that he has managed to present this study in a form which can be used for reference by a student unversed in ancient history. The specialist also will

find much that is fresh and stimulating in the author's approach to his subject.

The book is divided into two parts, of which the first sets the stage by describing the society of Greek states in their physical and moral aspects. The definition of the city-state as an independent urban centre free from all ethnic connexion (pp. 28-9) may well mislead the uninformed student and excite criticism from the specialist. In what sense can Sparta or Elis or even the Athens of Solon be called an urban centre? Does not citizenship in the Greek city-state derive from racial descent, for instance in Sparta after the reforms of Lycurgus and in Athens after the reforms of Cleisthenes? It would surely be truer to say that the Greek city-state was in general less urbanized and that its emphasis on race was greater than it is in the modern state, and that its higher degree of patriotism and of intimacy was due to just those facts. Nor is it easy to accept the author's views that the Spartiates were the only Dorians in Lacedaemonia, that Boeotia had an ethnic cohesion at least as strong as Attica (p. 56), and that the demes of Attica were originally local independent centres. When he turns to the moral qualities of the city-state, the passion for liberty, autonomy, and *autarkeia*, he is on much firmer ground and provides an abundance of examples. The 'internationales' of the Greek world are also outlined—the ideologies of democracy, oligarchy, and race.

In the second part, which comprises the bulk of the book, the international relations of the Greek city-states are

treated subject by subject. The treatment is full, the analysis is marked by an acute realism, and the exposition is enriched by a wealth of translation from the ancient sources. Although the moderns have attached the titles of league or confederacy to some of them, the alliances formed by the Greek states were essentially coalitions military in aim and temporary in character. Coalitions of a wider scope in which executive powers were entrusted to a leading state are styled 'symmachies hégémoniques' or 'symmachies dualistes' by Professor Martin, and it is from the abuse of these powers that he traces the development of imperialism, wherein the principle of collective security is ousted by the ambition of the leading state. His analysis of the powers vested in the hegemon is detailed and interesting, for he tries to define the extent to which, for instance, Sparta was entitled to conduct her diplomacy before consulting the congress of her allies. He also emphasizes the difference between the unilateral and the bilateral undertaking 'to have the same friend and enemy' and their respective implications. In the chapter dealing with the treaties of peace the difficulties of arguing from translations and not from the Greek texts are rather marked, and the

final chapter on arbitration contains a penetrating analysis of the difficulties experienced in a world of proudly sovereign states. He concludes that the concept of internationalism under the guise of Panhellenism was current only in intellectual circles and never in practical politics. There, as a result of exhaustion or of external pressures, various attempts at collective security were made for reasons of self-interest and not for the purpose of creating an international order of Greek states. Practical internationalism, then as now, can be achieved only by such a re-education of the individual citizen as Plato and Aristotle envisaged.

This very thorough treatment of inter-state relations excels in the rare combination of practical realism and of ideal values which is the hall-mark of ancient political thought. The historical narrative which forms the backbone of the book is marked by the same quality and adheres closely to Thucydides' interpretation of political motives in the greatest period of the city-state. In general this book is a notable achievement; and it has the additional merit that it is admirably printed and indexed.

N. G. L. HAMMOND.

Clare College, Cambridge.

ALEXANDER COINS

Gerhard KLEINER: *Alexanders Reichsmünzen*. (Abhandlungen der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaft zu Berlin, phil.-hist. Klasse, 1947, Nr. 5.) Pp. 55; 1 plate. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1949. Paper, DM 5.50.

AN immense amount of work, reading, and thought have gone into the structure of this thesis. In four chapters, supported by densely documented footnotes, Dr. Kleiner has endeavoured to show that the celebrated Alexander coinage started, not in Macedon before the invasion of Asia—as Edward Newell long ago proved—but rather in the Syro-Phoenician region after the fall of Tyre. An elaborate historical theory, buttressed by other theories about the

economics and finance of Macedon and Anatolia, is constructed; but the actual Alexander coins in their tens of thousands have not been at the learned writer's disposal. Now there must always be a difference between, on the one hand, the realm of theory and conjecture, and, on the other, the world of actual objects—the coins.

Edward Newell, himself a gifted scholar, was the possessor of many thousands of Alexander coins and had handled and examined many more thousands. Only a man who can match and even surpass such a record of scientific study can ever expect to overturn any of Newell's mature conclusions. Kleiner admits, with a disarming

honesty which does him credit, that two of Newell's key-articles ('Tarsos under Alexander', *A.J.N.* lii, 1918, and 'Myriandros', *A.J.N.* liii, 1919) have not been available to him. What he does not know is that in relation to his thesis those two articles are more vital than any of the articles which he has been able to see. Unfortunately for him there is another long and still more important work which Newell published in 1912 entitled *Reattribution of Certain Tetradrachms of Alexander the Great* (with 30 plates), for this is the great pioneer work on the Alexander coinage. In this brilliant paper Newell separated from out of the rest for the first time the long, rich series of tetradrachms minted in Amphipolis, and thereby supplied incontrovertible evidence that the peculiar 'dry' kind of beardless Herakles head ran on from Amyntas III, 389-369 B.C., through Perdikkas III, 365-359 B.C., and Philip II (see E. Babelon, *Traité*, pls. 305. 7 to 11, 14, 15, 20 to 23; 306. 18 to 27; 309. 15 to 19) to the early Alexander coinage of Macedon. This vital document was not known to Dr. Kleiner.

And here I feel entitled to act after a fashion as interpreter for Edward Newell, because in 1931, when I was myself studying the Alexander coinage, he and I discussed at length the problem now raised in Dr. Kleiner's paper. Newell himself had at an early stage perceived that on historical grounds three possible dates presented themselves for the introduction of the Herakles and seated Zeus types of the tetradrachm: (i) the beginning of Alexander's reign, (ii) the capture of Tarsus, (iii) the fall of Tyre. The coins themselves made the rejection of (ii) and (iii) imperative, and Newell had no manner of doubt that the Alexander coinage, gold and silver, originated shortly after the death of Philip II and well before the invasion of Asia. Anyone who is able to examine together Newell's *Reattribution of Certain Tetradrachms of*

Alexander the Great of 1912, and his 'Demanhur Hoard' (*N.N.M.* 19) of 1923—Dr. Kleiner had only the second of these at his disposal—must be convinced that this was the case.

Although lack of access to the essential material has made Dr. Kleiner's main thesis invalid, his chapter and notes will, because of their weight of learning, be of value to future historians and numismatists who may devote themselves to a study of Alexander. On these grounds the work is to be recommended, although Dr. Tarn's latest volumes, *Alexander the Great* (Cambridge, 1948), could not have been known to him.

I add a few points on details. P. 8, the three greatest mints operating during Alexander's lifetime were not 'Amphipolis, Babylon, Alexandria', but Amphipolis, Tarsus, Babylon. P. 13, and nos. 13 and 16 on the plate, it seems unwise to revive the older view that this coin was minted early in the reign; Sir George Hill (*B.M. Guide to the Principal Coins of the Greeks*, 1932, p. 53, no. 3) held that it was issued in some Eastern satrapy between 323 and 306 B.C. Further support for this is the head of Zeus on a unique coin of Seleucus I published by John Seltman (*Num. Chron.* 1946, pp. 67 f. and fig. 1). P. 18, it seems most improbable that anything is significant about a head being on the reverse, rather than the obverse, of a coin; surely it is only a matter of mint technique. P. 30, satrapal coins of Tarsus with Baal cannot be the prototypes for the seated Zeus on Alexander's tetradrachms; if coin prototypes are to be sought they may be found at Arcadian Heraea (Babelon, *Traité*, pl. 223, 17 to 23, etc.) and at Praesus in Crete (Seltman, *Greek Coins*, pl. 38. 4; *Traité*, pl. 245. 24 to 26; pl. 246. 1, 2). P. 55, the descriptions facing the plate have got jumbled for the third and fourth rows. The first coin in the bottom row is certainly of Alexandria.

CHARLES SELTMAN.

Queens' College, Cambridge.

GREEK PHONOLOGY

M. LEJEUNE: *Traité de phonétique grecque*. (Collection de Philologie Classique, III.) Pp. xvi+358. Paris: Klincksieck, 1947. Paper, 600 fr.

THIS work sets forth the history of Greek phonology within the framework of general phonetics as expounded, for instance, in Grammont's *Traité de Phonétique*. Let it be said straight away that the book is the product of a luminous and original intelligence: it is in fact one of the best introductions to the phonology of an Indo-European language known to the reviewer. It traces the development of each separate fact from Indo-European to the period of pro-ethnic Greek ('grec commun'), discusses the changes (together with their chronology) which occurred in the ancient Greek dialects, and gives a brief indication of the subsequent history down to modern times. Besides clarity of exposition M. Lejeune deserves well of his subject and his students by his treatment of unresolved problems: the discussions and analyses are almost invariably thought-provoking. Some such thoughts and queries provoked in the mind of one grateful student of Greek phonology may be set down here.

Is *κρῖθ* (p. 34)? It has been suggested that this is an Indo-European loan-word from a language with a plural suffix which is represented by the Greek *-θαι* (see Braun, *Die Urbbevölkerung Europas und die Herkunft der Germanen*, p. 62; Ebert, *Reallexikon der Vorgeschichte*, iv. 2. 525). The explanation of *λύκος* (p. 36) as the product of a contamination between **w/kwo* and **lufo* is not that of the standard handbooks (Schwyzer, p. 298) and the latter should be mentioned and discussed in a work of this character.

Since the relative chronology of the sound changes figures largely in Lejeune's treatment, it might have been pointed out that the dissimilation of aspirates as exemplified in **θάφος, τάφος* must be later than the change of *φῖ* > *πτ*: e.g. *θάπτω*, otherwise we should get **τάπτω*.

The Boeotian *ταππαματα* (p. 72) is now interpreted by P. Teyssier as *τ'ἀπ-πάματα* < *ἀναπάματα* (*R. de Ph.* 1940, 136 ff.). The Laconian *μῶα* might have been quoted on p. 83 as an example of the change of secondary intervocalic *-σ-*.

The treatment of the sounds *σσ* and *ττ* (pp. 84 ff.) diverges from orthodoxy. Lejeune assumes that the different Attic and Ionic spellings represent divergent phonetic treatments and he concludes from this that these sound changes were comparatively late developments. This reasoning falls to the ground if *σσ* and *ττ* are regarded merely as different graphic representations of a sound rendered earlier as *T*. He appears nowhere to consider the possibility which comparative phonetics would suggest that the sound in question may have been [ʃ] or [tʃ]. Apropos of this, might I make one more plea against the citing of the supposed change of I.E. **essi* > **esi* as evidence of an Indo-European sound law?

I have already spoken of the author's readiness to admit unsolved problems. One, however, has been given what is merely a specious explanation—the double Greek representation of an initial *ῖ* as an aspirate and a *ζ*. To explain the latter as the product of a 'pronunciation renforcée' without indicating the conditions under which the pronunciation is so 'reinforced' merely obscures the problem. Would it not be better to assume that Greek preserves a distinction which other languages have lost? It cannot be an accident that Greek also presents a corresponding double treatment of I.E. *u*. Whether this is yet another 'laryngeal' phenomenon (so W. M. Austin, *Language*, xvii, 1941, 83 ff.) is not yet certain, but it will clarify the problem if we remain true to our principles and refuse to admit the possibility of a double treatment of one and the same sound under the same circumstances.

In his treatment of *sheva secundum* Lejeune rejects the theories which regard this as an I.E. phoneme definable

in the usual way by a series of correspondences in the related languages: he treats it merely as a system of anaptyctic vowels—'voyelles d'appui'. I do not see the necessity for such an exclusive opposition. In fact it is necessary to assume that I.E. exhibited the same phenomena of general phonetics as any other language, and such features attributable to the parent language must have their correspondences in the daughter languages. In any case the observed facts remain the same: we have, for instance, *θάνατος* and *τέθαμεν*, and the new analysis does not attempt to define the conditions governing the interchange of what we have been accustomed to call reduced grade and zero grade.

A few minor points call for criticism. P. 124: signs of the disappearance of final *-v* are apparent long before the beginning of the Middle Ages (Mayser, *Gram. d. ptol. Pap.* i. 191 ff.). P. 128: the student will wish to have some exposition of the modern theories, so summarily dismissed, which attempt to account for the prothetic vowel in Greek. P. 151: does the transcription *προβειπαθα* necessarily imply a pro-

nunciation *v* instead of *w*? *β* may have been a bi-labial and not a labio-dental spirant. On p. 181 *ἀμιχθαλόεις* is connected with *δμίχλη* despite Pisani's attractive suggestion (*I.F.* liv. 39) that it means 'unsteady, shaking'. Nor does *ἀσθήρ* exhibit a prothetic vowel if we accept the derivation from **as* 'to burn' (*R.B. Ph.* xxi, 1942, 141 ff.). The first syllable of *παιπάλλω* is not necessarily the product of a dissimilation from **παλ-πάλλω*. It may be the intensive form of the reduplication (*ποι-φύσσω*, etc.). The history of the sound *o* (p. 207) should have included some indication of the development to *ou* in certain modern dialects. Traces of this treatment are not absent from earlier texts: e.g. *ὀκτοῦ P. Oxy.* 36, ix. 1 (iii/iv), *παντοπούλης M.A.M.A.* 3. 249 (Corycus), and *οὐκ οἶδα τίνι λόγῳ P. Genf.* 47. 5, although the last is complicated by morphological considerations. We miss, too (p. 209), a reference to the raising of *ε* before back vowels in some dialects and particularly in post-Classical Greek.

The book deserves a place in every classical library.

L. R. PALMER.

King's College, London.

CATALOGUES OF GREEK MANUSCRIPTS

Marcel RICHARD: *Répertoire des Bibliothèques et des Catalogues de Manuscrits Grecs*. Pp. xv+131. Paris: Centre de Documentation du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, 1948. Paper.

THE aim of this book is to give a complete list of up-to-date catalogues of existing, or recently dispersed, collections containing Greek manuscripts. It replaces O. Schissel's *Kataloge griechischer Handschriften* (1924), which had the same scope, but does not set out to replace V. Gardthausen's *Sammlungen und Cataloge gr. Hss.* (1903), which sought to document the history of past and present collections, or W. Weinberger's *Wegweiser durch die Sammlungen altphilologischer Hss.* (1930), which deals with Latin manuscripts also.

Father Richard lists also some older catalogues which contain details not ob-

tainable in their successors. He adds the approximate number of manuscripts in each collection as an indication of its importance. As to the definition of 'Greek manuscript' he follows that used by the compiler of each separate catalogue. He excludes papyri.

The book is well arranged and easy to handle, and will be a great help to prospective editors of texts. Absolute completeness and precision are as yet impossible in this field, because some collections have no catalogue, many catalogues are out of date, and most are defective. Father Richard allows scientific competence only to those of the Vatican and the Bibliothèque Nationale at Paris. Surely this is unfair. To take only three examples from other countries, what is defective in M. R. James's catalogues of Cambridge colleges, etc., Molhuysen and de Meijer's for Leyden,

Studemund, Cohn, and de Boor's for Berlin? Since the Balkan Wars there have been frequent shiftings of east European collections, with which no inventory can cope. Thefts continue, notably from Spain during the civil war, reset being mainly in the U.S.A. During the recent war, R. tells us (p. ix, n.), France lost nine Greek manuscripts, Italy none. He states that the Russians removed the Gotha library, with its Greek manuscripts. From inquiries in Germany I learn that they also took the Bremen and Lübeck collections, and most of the Berlin papyri, with fearful damage in transit, also the treasures of the Pergamon Museum; but they have not otherwise shown much interest in Ancient Greek affairs. Of the Königsberg and Breslau collections German scholars in Berlin and the western zones apparently know nothing, the Poles not answering inquiries. In Berlin the Philipps and Hamilton MSS. have suffered less than a dozen losses; the main Berlin collections are still stored at Marburg and Tübingen. Leipzig seems not to have lost manuscripts; Munich and Heidelberg have theirs substantially intact.

Adverse comments on Father Richard's work are few and on minor points. In his list of regional catalogues he does not make clear by his heading 'Autriche' that Gollob's *Verzeichnis* covers the Austrian Empire in its 1903 extent, including much of present-day Poland, Czechoslovakia, and Yugoslavia. Similarly, Graux's work on Sweden, 1889, covers Norway also. Omont's Netherlands catalogue is confined to public libraries—not that there are major private Greek manuscript collections. Smyly's 'Notes on Greek Manuscripts at Trinity College' should be listed under Dublin, not under Cambridge.

R. aims at listing even single Greek manuscripts occurring in heterogeneous libraries, and has covered scores of such, but does not note an Aristides, *De Musica* at Magdalene College, Cam-

bridge, listed by M. R. James; an Apollonius Rhodius in the Duke of Marlborough's library at Blenheim Palace (Weinberger, *Sitz.-ber. Wien. Akad.* 1898, p. 63); and the collection at Aretzu in Bithynia, stated by R. Förster (in Gardthausen, op. cit., p. 80) to include some Letters of Libanius.

In giving the names of libraries R. is inconsistent. For example, Leipzig 'Stadtbibliothek', Leicester 'Library of the Town Council', but Leeuwarden 'Bibliothèque Provinciale', when in fact it is called 'Provinciale Bibliotheek van Friesland'. To facilitate correspondence with librarians it would be well to list libraries in the language of the State they are in. He omits 'Apostolica' in the title of the papal library in the Vatican, and refers to the 'Biblioteca Publica' at Evora simply as 'Evora'. The 'Advocates' Library' at Edinburgh has been since 1925 the 'National Library of Scotland'.

For Monte Cassino, whose manuscripts have survived the library building itself, we are not told that the Inguanes catalogue, some parts of which have appeared, will deal with the Greek manuscripts in later parts. It is thus almost *en usage* for the period, likely to be long, during which R.'s repertory will not be superseded.

It is welcome news that Father Richard is about to make a summary inventory of all minor collections of Greek manuscripts. For this it would be a counsel of perfection to circularize all relevant librarians, as Gollob did in making his *Verzeichnis* for the Austrian Empire (when less than 1 per cent. failed to reply). Account should also be taken of auctions of privately owned collections, e.g. the Landau MSS. from Florence (catalogue in 2 vv., 1885-90), which were recently dispersed in London. In the meantime this *Répertoire* will be indispensable.

D. C. C. YOUNG.

University College, Dundee,
University of St. Andrews.

GREEK AND LATIN COMPOSITIONS

J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, J. BELL, C. M. BOWRA, A. N. BRYAN-BROWN, J. D. DENNISTON, T. F. HIGHAM, M. PLATNAUER: *Some Oxford Compositions*. Pp. xxxvi+324. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1949. Cloth, 21s. net.

CEDITE, quos quondam iactabat Graecia Septem;
extulerunt proprium postera saecula decus:
en septemgemino nova iam sapientia fonte
profluit, Oxoni quam foveat umbra sui.
gratia quanta fuit Graecis, quot Roma lepores
olim habuit, quantos utraque lingua sales,
haec sibi surripuit (reduces salvete, Camenae)
ingenio pollens, arte perita, manus.

There is a quality in this book which makes it far more than a mere collection of compositions, or of 'fair copies', arising as it does from what may perhaps be termed the spiritual unity of the seven contributors. 'The process of composition', says T. F. H. (acting as ἀρχεραυσιτής), 'meant more to them than the result.' Other books of versions have shown that respect for standards and that love for Latin and Greek which makes the 'pure' scholar untiring in their service, even though he knows that no pomp of learning on his part will necessarily be apparent; but the honesty and the honour of scholarship are especially visible in this book because of the avowed purpose and method of the 'composition club'. The contributors have viewed their task as 'being ethical no less than linguistic; and in consequence, in this beautifully objective demonstration of the ways of ancient thought, they have strikingly shown the deeper meaning of their art.

T. F. H. first expounds a 'metaphysic of Composition' and points arising from it, including a fascinating discussion of the difference between 'versions' and 'contemporary Latin'. If the versions themselves are read in the light of this, the mental processes of the composers will be understood; and the moral principle that lies behind the mechanics of composition will be clear to view. This introduction is of great value, not only as a highly sensitive exposition of practical wisdom, but as transmitting to the sceptical, or to the ignorant, the very *arcana* of this

austere form of discipline. The doctrine here set out is in the true line of the late W. R. Hardie's teaching; the use of parallels, models, 'tips', and 'tags' are all discussed with candour. T. F. H.'s firm consciousness that his art stands in its own right makes these pages very far from being a mere defence; the book itself seems to be speaking here through his words, and to give us, as it were, its autobiography.

In some collections of versions it is easy to pick out *lumina*. Here it is not—because of that unity already mentioned; nor would the contributors wish otherwise. The passages all show, in their several ways, how their writers have made themselves 'fellow-citizens with the ancients' (see p. xxiv). This is apparent, whether we look at, say, J. D. D. putting a chapter from *The Unpleasantness at the Bellona Club* into a Greek form that is a sheer delight, or T. F. H. showing brilliantly the Ovidian ethos of a page in *Home Chat*, or M. P.'s Greek rendering of Defoe, or J. G. B.-W.'s Latin version from John Bright, or A. N. B.-B.'s translation from Fielding, or J. B.'s of Trevelyan, or C. M. B.'s lyrics from Swinburne. Each has his individual approach (it is fascinating to turn the page, and see from the initials whether one's guess was right), but each is part of a wider whole.

It is good to find so many of J. G. B.-W.'s Latin verses here: a Horatian version of Samuel Butler's injunction to eat grapes downwards, a piece from *Sohrab and Rustum*, a poem of Bridges, some jolly lyrics, versions from Campion and John Bartlet (and an especially charming one from an anonymous poet). J. D. D. has a fine Ovidian swell in his version of *To all you ladies now at land*; T. F. H. provides a notable hexameter rendering of a prose passage on weather-portents, and makes some lines from Shelley's *Queen Mab* appear in Lucretian, Virgilian, and Ovidian form. In Greek verse, C. M. B. predominates. Those who know him only as a critic of Rilke or Blok would find much to ponder if they could read his lyric

translations of *Kubla Khan* and of the *Hounds of Spring* chorus (it is interesting to compare Archer-Hind's treatment of part of this), or his shorter pieces, e.g. from Raleigh or Flecker, or the lovely version of *Since first I saw your face*. Here, too, are T. F. H.'s Theocritean hexameters from *Love in the Valley* (his Gaisford Prize poem, now revised)—an outstanding commentary on his own Introduction—and a rollicking Aristophanean parabasis that turns out to be the nightmare-song from *Iolanthe* (to say nothing of an address to a golf-ball). J. D. D.'s beautiful rendering of *The glories of our blood and state* has now a special pathos. M. P. contributes a number of admirable iambic pieces.

The Latin prose passages are evenly distributed among the composers, but a larger proportion of the Greek prose comes from J. D. D. Here I will not attempt a selection: to adapt Lyly, *let this suffice, not to inquire which of them is the superior*, but that all bring like reward. They will not yield their full richness until after many readings. Like the verses, they show a respect for language and a deep restraint—a sort of *σωφροσύνη*—in expression, qualities which are the special secret of this book's compelling attraction. As the introduction tells us, the writers 'looked to each other for correction, not commendation', and there are notes in

which we find difficulties faced and discussed, reasons given for preferences, and (unusual, but entirely characteristic) acknowledgement made to pupils or examination candidates for their suggestions. By scrutinizing these versions, and by discovering why the English was recast in this or that particular form, a whole world of knowledge will be gained of the structure of Greek and Latin, and of the manner of thought for which the language serves as a dress. Nor will one class of reader alone so profit; the sixth-former or undergraduate will find the book a penetrating teacher, and the don or professor will gain from it new refreshment for his faith (and one at any rate has discovered just how little he knew before).

The book is dedicated to the memory of Barrington-Ward, and there is a prefatory inscription to him in noble Latin. One such loss would have seemed enough; but there is another memory now: Denniston's death came too late to be commemorated here. The first piece bears the initials J. G. B.-W.; the last is signed J. D. D.; and the whole book bears witness to them both. Their nightingales still live. They, and their colleagues with them, have made abundantly clear those intangible principles, at once intellectual and moral, on which classical scholarship is based.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University College, Cardiff.

SHORT REVIEWS

A. SEVERYNS: *Homère—III; L'Artiste*. Pp. 198; 1 plate. Brussels: Office de Publicité, 1948. Paper, 70 B.fr.

IN 1943 Professor Severyns published in the Collection Lebègue two parts of a work on Homer (*Homère, le Cadre Historique*, 2nd edition 1944—88 pp., and *Homère, le Poète et son Œuvre*, 2nd edition 1946—94 pp.), which he promised to complete in a third volume. The appearance of this third volume provides an opportunity for drawing attention to the whole work as one which will amply repay study.

The present volume has three main sections: *Points de Départ* (pp. 7–42), in which S. discusses the evidence for the course of events at Troy before the quarrel over Briseis; *Arrière-Plans Légendaires* (pp. 43–95), on the legendary material

available to Homer and his 'innovations' on that material; and *Le Métier du Poète* (pp. 97–149), dealing with Homer's technique in narrative and the description of character. A *Finale*, entitled 'Homère vivant' (pp. 150–64) deals especially with the similes. There are full indexes to the whole work, and some additions and corrections to the two earlier volumes.

S. agrees generally with the modern 'unitarians', but his discussion of 'retouches' and 'remaniements' in the *Catalogue* (p. 12), his aspersions on the 'homéricité' of *Ares* and *Aphrodite* (p. 101, n. 1), and his acceptance of Aristarchus' view that 'Homer's *Odyssey*' ended at xxiii. 296 (p. 14, n. 1) imply such doubts about the soundness of the received text that it is hard to see how he can logically believe that our *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are

substantially the work of a single author. Where this difficulty is not involved, S.'s comments on questions of epic technique, of chronology, and of genealogy are shrewd and very often illuminating; where they do not throw actual light upon a problem, they sometimes succeed in substituting, as Bentley tried to do, 'a transpicuous gloom' for 'darkness visible'.

J. A. DAVISON.

University of Manchester.

Ph. E. LEGRAND: *Hérodote, Histoires*, Livre VI. (Collection Budé.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1948. Paper, 350 fr.

CHAPTERS 1-42 of Book VI were discussed in the previous volume, in the *Notice* covering the Ionian Revolt (v. 28-vi. 42). The remainder of Book VI (Darius contre la Grèce; Marathon) is here examined (pp. 33-64), with particular reference to the complexity of plan, the numerous *παρενθήκαι*, and their significance for chronology and Herodotean method. L. finds equal complexity in sources, but material for European Greece derives mainly from Athens, including family archives (usually Alcmaeonid, sometimes Philaid); and he accepts legal records as a basis of much of the Miltiades episode (chs. 132 ff., e.g.; an accuser's speech). Athenian bias also explains the hardening of H.'s attitude to Aegina. Textually Book VI presents no important problems, and L.'s own suggestions concern only very minor points. The apparatus is again more detailed than that of Hude. But sometimes expansion is needed, e.g. 39. 7, 52. 10, 55. 5, 69. 23-4, 75. 10, 100. 4, 116. 3; also 47. 4 *ἦτις νῦν . . . ἐσχηκε* ('dont le nom actuel fut alors emprunté à ce Thasos') in view of *νῦν*, deletion of which Stein suggested as alternative to his conjectural *ἐσχηκε*. In 64. 4, *διότι Richards* follows Hude (i.e. C.R. xix, 1905, p. 343); but see Macan (1895) and cf. Schweighauser ad loc. The translation maintains the good standard previously set. Elsewhere, especially in apparatus and footnotes, the volume unfortunately contains misprints and small errors too numerous to list fully. For 63. 13 *ἐς τὸ* and 69. 16 *καλέοντι* read *ἐς τὰ* and *καλέονται* respectively. At 55. 4 for *εἰράραι AP* read *AB*. The apparatus confuses *συμβαλεῖν* in 109. 2 and 3. Footnotes are sometimes superfluous, occasionally misleading, e.g. p. 124, n. 1 (Pausanias does not mention the Barathrum: Hdt. vii. 133—not quoted—does, but omits Miltiades), p. 126, n. 1 (Brauron 'sur la côte Nord de l'Attique'). On p. 41 (Thasos and Abdera), pp. 50, n. 3, 52, n. 2, 56, n. 6, 57, n. 1, 59, nn. 1 and 2, 60, n. 1, the text quoted is not L.'s own.

G. CLEMENT WHITTICK.

King's College, Newcastle-upon-Tyne.

Hans Georg OERI: *Der Typ der komischen Alten in der griechischen Komödie, seine Nachwirkung und seine Herkunft*. Pp. 100. Basel: Schwabe, 1948. Paper, 5 Sw. fr.

THIS dissertation amounts to a collection of passages from ancient Comedy, with very brief comment but with some useful references in the foot-

notes. No striking conclusions emerge (though I find it surprising that in the extant fragments, if O.'s collection is exhaustive, the old woman as the type of superstitious credulity does not seem to appear: cf. Mayor's note on Cic. *N.D.* i. 55). He is throughout handicapped by a self-imposed schematism of treatment: it is a pity that he handles Old Comedy in a separate chapter, for his passages from Ar. *Ecd.* and *Plut.* would be more at home in his next section on *Méon* and *Néa*.

In his third chapter O. examines later writing (Lucian, *Dial. Mer.*, Herondas, etc.) for influence of the type, with scanty result, apart from some cross-references, while in his last part he ransacks earlier authors for origins. This seems thorough, but his treatment of the influence of Tragedy, for example, could be taken farther.

An *index locorum* would have increased the value of the work, and a geographical error on p. 96 needs correcting: 'ähnliche Paare, die "Mad Moll and her husband" . . . in Hitchin in Südwest-England an der Grenze von Wales'. But this and the few misprints I noted are not misleading and O.'s work is careful. The inconclusiveness of this study may be due more to the subject than to the author, and I hope he will not be deterred from attempting something similar in perhaps a more fertile field.

JOHN G. GRIFFITH.

Jesus College, Oxford.

Karel JANÁČEK: *Prolegomena to Sextus Empiricus*. (Acta Universitatis Palackianae Olomucensis, Vol. 4.) Pp. 64. Olomouc, Czechoslovakia: University. Paper, 7s.

It is well known that part of the contents of Sextus Empiricus' *Πυρρῶν εἰσοδημάτων* is repeated in his *Adversus Mathematicos* vii-xi. In this study (written in English) the author shows that in the later work the repeated passages are marked by certain differences of form, style, and vocabulary, and argues that the author is deliberately employing more lucid and correct language for the benefit of 'more elementary students and readers than those for whom he wrote *P.H.*'. It is certainly surprising to find that while he uses *ἀλλ' οὐδέ* 45 times in *P.H.* he almost entirely extirpates it from *M.* vii-xi (though whether because *ἀλλ' οὐδέ* might be confused with *ἄλλου δέ* seems doubtful), that he similarly suppresses *οὐκοῦν οὐδέ*, that *ἵνα δὲ καὶ*, employed sometimes in *P.H.* in a curious concessive sense, 'to grant that', in every sense wholly disappears in *M.* vii-xi, as do the later and doubtless incorrect negative expressions, *ἐπεὶ μὴ* and *οὐ μὴ*. On the other hand *δέ γε*, hardly used in *P.H.*, occurs 147 times in *M.* vii-xi, *καὶ δὲ* in various senses 32 times in *M.* vii-xi, once in *P.H.*, *καὶ μὴν* 129 times in *M.* vii-xi, 5 only in *P.H.*

There is no doubt that Sextus was more particular about his style in *A.M.* He is fond of using coupled synonyms and other elementary rhetorical devices, and of substituting for *εἰς* words like *καθίστασθαι*, *τυγχάνειν*, *ὑπάρχειν*. Janáček calls attention to the fact that 'Arnim in his *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta* reprints Sextus' conception of the Stoic doctrine in the formulation of *M.*

vii-xi, which bears the characteristic features of Sextus' style', and obviously thinks that Arnim would have done better to quote from P.H. It cannot be said that the examples of 'the stronger pedagogical tendency' in M. vii-xi given by Janáček amount to very much. The book, which is a minute and careful study of the linguistic side of Sextus' writings, is, we are told, preparatory to further work on the same subject.

J. H. SLEEMAN.

Cicero: *De Inventione, De Optimo Genere Oratorum, Topica*. With an English translation by H. M. HUBBELL. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xviii+466. London: Heinemann, 1949. Cloth, 15s. net.

NEITHER the *De Inventione* nor the *Topics* shows Cicero to great advantage. The one is a youthful compilation, jejune, awkward, and dull, which compares unfavourably with the probably contemporary *Ad Herennium*; and in the other, which professes to be a synopsis of Aristotle's *Topics* made from memory, the writing is mature but the contents give it little scope. The *De Optimo Genere Oratorum*, a short introduction to translations of Aeschines and Demosthenes which may never have been written, shows the Cicero of the major rhetorical works but was probably left unrevised. The general reader is not likely to gain much from the trio, but Professor Hubbell has done his best for him and produced a faithful version which is as readable as a version of such works can be. Some slips call for correction. *Inv. i. 9 potissimum* is misconstrued; 25 *res nova* is clearly not 'a new topic' (since it is to appear at the beginning of a speech) but a novelty or a paradox; 28 *ut ne narres* is not 'so that you do not need to tell' but 'without your telling'; 32 *descriptio* is not 'description' but 'analysis'; 33 *ne quid posterius praeter conclusionem dicatur* is not 'so that nothing be introduced after the conclusion' (which is nonsense); ii. 6 *enodata diligenter exposuit* is not 'gave a painstaking exposition of the difficult parts'; 49 *distinguitur oratio* is not 'is rendered distinguished'; 53 *verbi causa* is not 'as far as words are concerned' but 'for example'; 95 *in aetate* is not 'at times' but 'in life'; 106 *aliquo in loco magno* is not 'at some great crisis' (*magno* goes with the following *usui*); 132 *minus frequenter operam rei publicae det* is not 'serving the State less frequently' but 'absenting himself from public duty' (cf. *miles frequens, infrequens*); *Top. 3 ut opinor* does not modify *Aristotelis* (Cicero is so made inconsistent with himself); 22 *quod fornix viti fecerit* is not 'the loss which is caused by the arch' but 'any damage suffered by the arch' (cf. 15); 37 *hinc cum redierint* is not 'hence when it returns' but 'when it returns from there' (i.e. from enemy hands).

The editor's textual notes are few and very selective. At *Inv. ii. 104* he accepts (unnecessarily) Kayser's *dicens* for *diceres* without making the consequential change of omitting *si*; at ii. 122 the difficulty of *dicet* and at ii. 145 the anacoluthon left by retaining *sed* are glossed over in translation.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Gai *Institutiones secundum Veronensis apographum Studemundianum et reliquias in Aegypto reperlitas* edidit M. DAVID. Editio minor. (Studia Gaiana, Vol. I.) Pp. xv+157. Leiden: Brill, 1948. Boards, 5g.

THIS handy little volume, designed principally for the use of students, contains the text of Gaius with a minimum of textual commentary. It follows as closely as possible the Verona palimpsest (which, however, is full of errors—*mendis scatet*) supplemented with the help of the Oxyrhynchus and Antinoite fragments. The author has refrained from supplying *lacunae* in the text with merely conjectural emendations. As he says, 'legentibus id minus commodum fore probe novi sed ante omnia id agendum putavi ne quid Gaiiani sermonis imaginem turbet'. This *editio minor* of Gaius is to be followed by an *editio maior* in which Professor J. C. van Oven and Dr. H. L. W. Nelson will co-operate with Dr. David. This will be eagerly awaited.

R. W. LEE.

Oxford.

Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros *de Praescriptione Haereticorum, adversus Praxeum*, edidit J. N. BAKHUIZEN VAN DEN BRINK. Pp. 119. The Hague: Daamen, 1946. Cloth, fl. 4.50.

Q. Sept. Florentis Tertulliani libros *de Patientia, de Baptismo, de Paenitentia*, edidit J. W. PH. BORLEFFS. Pp. 115. The Hague: Daamen, 1948. Cloth, fl. 6.50.

THE former of these texts is of no special value, being for the most part a reprint, though not an accurate one, of that of Kroymann. Throughout *de Praescriptione* and occasionally in *adversus Praxeum* the punctuation is so erratic as to suggest doubts whether the editor has perceived the meaning of the Latin or even supposes it to have any meaning at all. Editors and translators will no doubt come to see that the value of Kroymann's work lies chiefly in his apparatus criticus, which is excellent, but that his text incorporates too many of his own reckless and unnecessary conjectures.

Dr. Borleffs's work, on the other hand, is of primary importance, being a careful reconstruction of the text of the three treatises, with a copious apparatus and occasional suggestions as to the meaning of obscure phrases, preceded by a reasoned account of the manuscript authorities. These include (for *de Patientia*) the Luxembourg codex 75, which appears to be a fifteenth-century copy of the lost Hirsauensis; and (for the other two treatises, though with some *lacunae*) the Troyes MS. 523. Of both these the editor has made collations, the results of which he gives in his critical notes. One might, in passing, ask whether Luxemburgensis or a copy of it was one of the Leiden manuscripts examined by Oehler, who seems to have known of some of its readings. Dr. Borleffs's own conjectures are, as a rule, based on the new evidence, and a number of them will probably obtain acceptance: among them may be mentioned *fastidientes iniuriam* (*Pat. 10*), *etiam caelesti* (*Bapt. 3*), *si idolo . . . auspici* (*Bapt. 5*), *quorum fides tuta sit* (*Bapt. 12*). One might ques-

tion whether a single manuscript (even a good one) is sufficient authority to justify barbarisms like *subiendae mortis*, or *baptismum* as a neuter nominative (especially as there are places in the same manuscript where the concords require the masculine form). There are misprints on p. 17, l. 1 (where read *temere me*), p. 31, l. 10 (*iniuriarum*), p. 102, l. 1 (*etsi*), and on p. 53, l. 14 the comma should probably follow the first (not the second) *ferebatur*. In the note to p. 90, l. 11, possibly *oculos* should be corrected to *oculorum*. On p. 39, l. 5, if *spiritus* is the true reading it does not mean *un souffle*, as stated in the note, but the Holy Spirit as the Author of the Scriptures; but one would suggest *sanctio* as nearer to the MS. tradition. Dr. Borlefs is to be thanked for a valuable piece of work, which will be indispensable to all future editors and students of these three treatises.

The general editors of the series *Scriptores Christiani Primaevi*, in which these texts appear as vols. ii and iv, might inquire whether *primaevus* means what they appear to think it means and whether *Sept.* does not more appropriately represent the *praenomen* Septimus than the *nomen* Septimius.

E. EVANS.

Gisela M. A. RICHTER: *Roman Portraits*. Pp. 64 + 56 half-tone plates. New York: Metropolitan Museum of Art, 1948. Paper, \$1.50.

THIS attractive picture-book contains reproductions of almost the whole collection of Roman portraits in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, including gems, cameos, and a few gold coins. And a rich collection it is: practically every phase in the evolution of Roman iconography, from late republican times down to Constantine, is represented by one or more striking examples. The essentials of the story are concisely told in an introduction of six pages calculated to stimulate the interest of the visitor and the general reader, while the short bibliographical notes appended to each of the 110 items will be of value to the specialist. The remark on p. 1 about 'the old Roman custom of making waxen images of the faces of the dead' is, perhaps, a little unfortunate, since it suggests, if it does not explicitly state, the now discredited notion that the Romans cast death-masks directly from the corpse in early times. On the other hand, the author rightly stresses the continuity of Roman with late Greek realistic portraiture. Hellenistic and Roman portraits do not reflect fundamentally different conceptions of the art: the difference lies essentially in the types of persons portrayed. Portraits of Roman subjects found, and presumably executed by Greek artists, in Greek lands, such as the republican head in coarse-grained marble from Egypt (No. 3 in this collection) and the marble head of a priest (?) from the Athenian Agora (*Hesperia*, 1935, pp. 405-6, figs. 30, 31), can be as 'veristic' as anything found in the West. Among the more unusual items are the faience and glass cameo heads of Augustus (Nos. 21 and 26), the marble head of a barbarian (?), assigned to the Trajanic period (No. 61), with the same style of

'coma in gradus formata' as that affected by a couple of lictors on the Beneventum arch, the head of Lucius Verus, said to have been found in Rome, from a lost historical relief (No. 81), and the marble head of a Severan lady with painted eyes, probably of eastern provenance (No. 90). The Emperor in military dress, standing in front of his tent, while a suppliant barbarian kneels before him, on a fragmentary stucco relief (No. 76) has been identified as Antoninus Pius, and the head certainly shows some resemblance to portraits of that Emperor. But the tapering face and shock of hair above the brow have also a fleeting look of Marcus Aurelius, who fits the theme, whereas Pius never took the field in person. One of the Metropolitan Museum's most recent acquisitions, a powerful, probably posthumous, head of Caracalla (No. 107), in which realism and idealism are effectively harmonized, epitomizes the best qualities of Roman portraiture and is well chosen to adorn the cover.

J. M. C. TOYNBEE.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

Leslie Walker KOSMOPOULOS: *The Prehistoric Inhabitation of Corinth*. Vol. I. Pp. xxii + 73; 51 half-tone figs., 4 colour plates. Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1948. Paper.

THE eager anticipation likely to be aroused by such a title among archaeologists who know that much prehistoric material from Corinth (including neolithic) has long awaited publication, will be somewhat disappointed by this book. But for the war it would have appeared in 1940, and it does not claim even now to be complete; yet the delays of two wars and the intervening peace, and what is cryptically called 'the constant failure of practical facilities for accomplishment', can hardly justify the scheme of presentation adopted. Chapter i begins with a summary account of the five phases (Corinthian I-V) into which the author divides the prehistoric inhabitation of Corinth, and then describes the excavations, conducted at various dates in the last half-century, in which prehistoric remains have been found there. Chapter ii presents a synopsis of the material characteristic of each of the five phases; chapter iii recapitulates, dividing the remains according to the types of material (bone, stone, pottery, etc.) which are represented; and we are promised an analytical account of the finds in the next volume. Such analysis must surely have preceded the conclusions which the present volume presents, and might well, therefore, have been published first. As things are, it is not always easy for the reader to see just how the sequence of periods has been established, however willing he may be to accept it; and the account of the various pottery styles is not full enough for the student not already familiar with them to form a clear picture of either the shapes or the decoration of each. The nomenclature, moreover, is unhelpful. 'Rainbow Ware' and 'Corinthian Brown Ware' are stated (p. 1) to be 'comparable to, if not identical with', pottery from Thessaly classified as Monochrome Red Ware and Red on White Painted Ware; but Plate I seems to show clearly that they

are not identical with these Thessalian wares, whatever the value of the comparison may be; and it is muddling to be told later that 'Red on White' was 'a style of painting rather than a ware', not necessarily executed in red, or on white. Again, it shakes the reader's confidence, having learnt on p. 1 that 'Corinthian Brown Ware' occurs 'in quantity' in deposits of Period I, to find on p. 41 that this is in fact one of the wares 'datable to Period II', and regarded as fortuitous when occurring in a Period I deposit which contained 92 per cent Rainbow Ware.

One can in fact get a much clearer notion of the sequence of neolithic wares at Corinth from Weinberg's article in *Hesperia* vi, pp. 487 ff., even though it had to be based on a more limited quantity of finds. To Mrs. Kosmopoulos, unfortunately, the excavation on which that article rests was nothing less than a piratical and wanton destruction of deposits left untouched by her to serve as 'controls'. It is impossible, nor would it be proper, for the reviewer to sort out the rights and wrongs of this question of archaeological etiquette; but the detached student may well be disposed to use Weinberg's work as in effect an independent check.

In other respects there is a good deal in the book that pleases; good typography, good photographs, drawings (including the colour plates) as only Piet de Jong can do them; and not least the sympathetic observation of modern Greek peasant life which the writer brings to her aid in approaching the study of a prehistoric culture. Many a footnote enshrouds fascinating vignettes: dairies on the mountain-side, caïques loaded deep with water-jars, plane-tree-shaded fountains—things which the carping might find irrelevant and which are therefore usually crowded out of a scientific work, but dear to all archaeologists who have worked in Greece.

F. H. STUBBINGS.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge.

Antonio ALTAMURA: Iacopo Sannazaro, *De Partu Virginis*. Edizione critica. (Studi e Testi Umanistici, Serie IIa, Testi e Documenti, Vol. 20.) Pp. xv + 75. Naples: Casella, 1948. Paper, L. 500.

THIS short religious epic in three books by one of the best of the Renaissance Latin poets is something of a *tour de force*. In spite of the sacred nature of the theme and its central importance for Christian theology, the poem is cast in the traditional mould with much of the machinery and apparatus of the classical epic, of which the poet makes clever use. One instance must suffice. The Augustan census which brought Joseph and Mary to Bethlehem provides a spring-board for an elaborate catalogue of the peoples of the Roman world, in which considerable descriptive skill and elegant variety of phrasing are shown. Throughout the work there are few lapses from tact in idea and phrase. The thought and diction owe much to classical and early Christian writers. Altamura has attempted to illustrate some of these debts, but not always with success, since occasionally the

connexion is not strikingly obvious. The reader will be conscious of many verbal reminiscences which are not noted, e.g. to Virgil, Ovid, and Statius.

The text offers few difficulties to an editor. Among the seven manuscripts listed here there are two autographs, viz. Laurent. XXXIV. 44, and Laurent. Ashburnh. 411 (dated 1513); the claim of Vatic. lat. 3360 to be from the hand of Sannazaro is false. These autographs give an early version of the poem, which was to undergo much change in the process of revision. Of the three early printed editions, Fressa's Naples edition of May 1526 is declared by its publisher to be based on autographs. Altamura concludes from his investigation that this printed edition represents Sannazaro's final version of the poem as contained in autographs now lost, and he supposes that Minucio Calvo's Rome edition of December 1526 is not a mere reprint from the Naples edition, but is based on Vindob. lat. 3316, which, though demonstrably not an autograph, is related to the latest autographs. He therefore takes the Naples edition as the basis for his text; and rightly, because in the only places where the two editions are cited as differing in any important respect, viz. at 1. 75; 3. 266, 282, 330, 439, the Naples readings are superior. There is odd punctuation at 1. 80, 129, 193; 2. 21, 121; 3. 249, 267. Capital letters are missing from 2. 201, 444; 3. 289. A capital letter has intruded in 1. 413. Misprints appear in the text at 2. 240 (*ob* for *ab*), 2. 382 (*cernus* for *cernuus*). In the notes a line reference to Sedulius has dropped out at 1. 75. The editor finds Ashburnham a difficult word, which he nowhere spells correctly.

J. F. LOCKWOOD.

University College, London.

David M. ROBINSON: *America in Greece: a Traditional Policy*. Pp. 195; 7 portraits. New York: Anatolia Press, 1948. Cloth, \$3.50.

THE name of the author and the title of the book alike claim both sympathy and attention; but it is a curious book. 'Neither history nor archives', says Professor Robinson in a modest introduction, but a small selection of documents of the time of the War of Independence, which 'do not constitute an epoch-making discovery, but we hope they will serve to strengthen weakened memories by reminding our readers that in the libraries and archives of this land there is a wealth of material of interest and value to the historian and the research man. . . . A testimonial to the quality and value of American interest in Greece and an encouragement to others . . . to extend research in this field.' We have a few formal letters from Greek leaders to prominent Americans, and some replies, including a facsimile of Jefferson's very interesting letter to Koraës on the best constitution; resolutions of sympathy by various associations, cities, and states; forty-eight pages in facsimile of the official report of the debate on Greek affairs in the House of Representatives in January 1824 (ending with 'the subject was for the present dismissed'); extracts from newspapers; and, to conclude, resolutions of the Senate on

Koritsá in 1920 and 1945 and President Truman's speech on new foreign policy (the date not recorded).

Unfortunately we are not told where some of the documents are to be found; and there are numerous misprints: Jefferson's letter has the pages in the wrong order and one page at least apparently missing; a few of the misprints may be due to the originals, but we should expect a footnote, for example, to 'the Honorable Richard George', who is presumably General Church, in the letter from Kolokotronés. America's inability (for reasons of morality) to do anything for Greece at that time except pass resolutions of sympathy, and her remoteness from the wicked behaviour of the Holy Alliance, are made clear; but I regret to say that one American was prepared to secure the freedom of Greece by sacrificing Serbia, Rumania, and a good deal of Greece itself to the imperialist ambitions of European powers.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

J. G. MILNE: *Finds of Greek Coins in the British Isles*: the evidence reconsidered in the light of the Rackett Collection from Dorset. Pp. 48; 3 maps. London: Oxford University Press, 1948. Paper, 5s. net.

DR. J. G. MILNE, Deputy Keeper of Coins in the Ashmolean Museum, recently had submitted to him for examination a collection of coins, mainly Greek autonomous bronze, which had been gathered together by the Rev. Thomas Rackett, Rector of Spettisbury, Dorset, from 1780 to 1840. In the notes which accompanied the coins Mr. Rackett gave the find-spots of fifty of the Greek autonomous bronze. These find-spots were all in east Dorset, within easy reach of Mr. Rackett's own parish, and were presumably verified by him. Dr. Milne at once saw that these coins, with their well-authenticated find-spots, provided him with a weapon for confounding those sceptics who have persistently regarded with suspicion all records of the finding of Greek autonomous bronze coins in Britain.

Dr. Milne points out that Mr. Rackett's Greek autonomous bronze coins came mainly from the Central Mediterranean area—Sicily, Italy, and Carthage—with the addition of a smaller group from Syria, and were exactly the sort of coins which Mediterranean traders might be expected to have in their possession when they voyaged to Britain during the last three centuries B.C. Moreover the Greek autonomous bronze coins reported to have been found on other sites in Britain prove, on re-examination by Dr. Milne, to have in the main the same origins as the east Dorset finds—the Central Mediterranean and the Levant—and must be accounted for in the same way, that is, by trade connexions between the Mediterranean and pre-Roman Britain.

Thanks to Dr. Milne's careful study of the Rackett Collection and of other records of the finding of Greek autonomous bronze coins in Britain, such finds can no longer be lightly dismissed as accidental, or even imaginary, but must

be given respectful consideration by archaeologist and numismatist alike.

ANNE S. ROBERTSON.

University of Glasgow.

L. L. HAMMERICH: *Laryngeal before Sonant*. (Kgl. Danske Vidensk. Selskab, Historisk-filologiske Meddelelser, XXXI. 3.) Pp. 90. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1948. Paper, kr. 12.

PROFESSOR HAMMERICH assumes for Indo-European and the earliest phases of the separate languages a single voiced laryngeal phoneme (by him written *H*), to the combination of which with following sonant he attributes diverse phenomena in many languages. Unfortunately, in most of the cases he treats, no independent evidence suggests the presence of a laryngeal even to adherents of some form of laryngeal theory. Thus his argument that *Hj*- gave Gk. ζ- is neat, but, in the words of his own criticism of Sturtevant, 'depends solely upon theoretical considerations' so long as he makes no attempt (as did van Langenhove) to demonstrate more directly the presence of a laryngeal. The same criticism can be brought against his explanation of the consonant groups represented in *ἀκρος*, etc., that they represent a guttural followed by *Hj*; in all cases the laryngeal, in most the *j*, too, is hypothetical, while his treatment of the Greek forms is cursory. He operates much with contamination (for example in his account of Skt. *duhitṛ*, Av. *dugədar*) and metathesis of an often undemonstrated laryngeal (as in his treatment of γόνυ, πρόγυνυ, ἰγνύνη). The influence of recent phonological doctrines seems to account for some rather otiose theories, for example that the loss of *p* in Celtic was due to the generalization of *H* before initial *u*; the similar argument that in Greek all initial vowels received a laryngeal can hardly be relevant to the late invention of the smooth breathing. Of his essays in Hittite phonology specialists may judge; by his view that medial *Hj* gave Hittite *š* he is led to derive Hit. *ha-an-ša-lar* from **gonHjotor* or **gonHjetor*, unattractive forms from the standpoint of word-formation. The suggestion that in most Indo-European languages *hu* is represented by *au* against Indo-Iranian *u* has some plausibility, but he omits the discussion of possible contrary examples (e.g. ὄδη, ἀφ-ύω). Of his other views few are free from such weaknesses. Space does not allow mention of many details; it is surprising to find ἀπέργω translated 'I wipe dry' and the resuscitation of the form πύρι. It is regrettable that of so many interesting suggestions made with much learning and acuteness few are well enough founded to carry conviction.

D. M. JONES.

Birkbeck College, London.

Sister Mary Tarcisia BALL: *Nature and the Vocabulary of Nature in the Works of Saint Cyprrian*. (Catholic University of America Patristic Studies, Vol. 75.) Pp. xix+303. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1946. Paper.

THIS book is a painstaking catalogue or concordance of all the occurrences of certain words in

Cyprian's writings, and as such it will be of use. The apologetic works, the disciplinary works, and the letters are treated separately, and in each the expression of certain concepts, beginning with the heavenly bodies and ending with tastes and smells, is examined exhaustively. All the relevant passages are translated in the text and quoted in the original at the foot of the page.

Descriptions of the real world, metaphors, and dead metaphors or school clichés are not sufficiently distinguished. And there is a certain naïve disregard of Cyprian's pagan education. For instance, in discussing on p. 135 the phrase 'pudeat divites sterilitatis atque infelicitatis suae' (*de Opere et Eleemosynis* 15 Sister Ball asks whether *infelicitas* here means 'unhappiness' or 'unfruitfulness'; she gives the right answer, but apparently without realizing that we have here a reminiscence of Virgil's 'infelix lolium et steriles dominantur avenae'. So, too, such phrases as 'fluctuans vario

mentis aestu' are examined on pp. 106 ff. without any reference to *Aen.* xii. 486 'vario nequiquam fluctuat aestu'. And the long passage in *de Op. et Eleem.* 25 on the goods of nature as common to all is treated on p. 81 without any mention that this is a commonplace of ancient thought (cf. *inter alia* Cic. *Off.* i. 51, Ovid, *Met.* vi. 439 ff., Petron. 100. 1, Marcian in *Dig.* i. 8. 2. 14, Justinian, *Inst.* ii. 1. 2) which rolled effortlessly off the tongue of a former teacher of rhetoric. Surely this adaptation of pagan traditions to Christian purposes is one of the most important features of Cyprian's work, setting the model for the fourth-century fathers.

Inaccuracies are few. But the *frumentarii* who came to take Cyprian to Utica (*ep.* 81. 1) were not 'grain dealers', as Sister Ball would have it on p. 227. And it only makes matters worse to refer in explanation to Pauly-Wissowa, i. 121-5.

ROBERT BROWNING.

University College, London.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

XLV. 1: JANUARY 1950

R. J. Getty, *Romulus, Rome and Augustus in the Sixth Book of the Aeneid*: suggests that Virgil regards A. as a second Romulus and as Jupiter's vicegerent. A. C. Johnson, *Lucius Domitius Domitianus Ahenobarbus*: examines the evidence of coins and documents for the history of this claimant to the Empire: his revolt occurred between 23 July and 29 August, A.D. 297, and he captured Alexandria in the early spring of 298. Aubrey Diller, *Julian of Ascalon on Strabo and the Stadi*: traces the history of the meteorological excerpt ascribed to Julian back through the *συλλογὴ τακτικῶν* written under Leo VI to the third appendix to Aelian's *Tactica*. Ernst Hohl, *Zeit und Zweck der pseudoxenophontischen Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία*: the work belongs to the period of the Thirty Years' Peace; it is a letter written, not for publication, by an Athenian oligarch to a sympathizer in Sparta. A. W. Allen: in Prop. i. 2. 9 proposes *humus non culta* (*culta* having fallen out before *colores* and the gap having been filled by *formosa* suggested by l. 11); in 1. 8 transposes 13-14 to follow 18, retaining *ut te* and accepting Heinsius' *post victa for praevecta*. A. H. Travis, *Donatus and the Scholia Danielis* (addendum to *Harv. Stud.* liii. 157): notes differences in usage and formulae between D. and the non-Servian parts of Sch. Dan. R. P. Oliver, *The Oedipus of Plautus*: the fragments of the *O.* announced by Osann in 1826 in his edition of Apuleius *De Grammatica* he found in Joannes Arretinus: they are in fact quotations from *Epidicus* and Arr. probably took them in good faith from a manuscript of a grammatical work now lost in which *epidico* had been corrupted to *edipo*.

RIVISTA DI FILOLOGIA CLASSICA

N.S. XXVII (1949). 3-4.

A. Ardzizoni, *Il problema della satira in Orazio*: discusses Horace's references to satire as a *genus*

scribendi in *Sat.* i. 4 and argues that the promise to discuss the question *alias* is fulfilled in *Sat.* i. 10. A. Salvatore, *De Laudibus Pisonis cum Panegyrico Messallae atque Calpurni Bucolicis comparatis*: suggests that the *Laudes Pisonis* imitate the *Panegyricus Messallae*, that the *Laudes* have so much in common with the *Bucolica* of Calpurnius that they must be by the same author, that the Piso to whom the *Laudes* are addressed is the Calpurnius Piso described by Tacitus in *Ann.* xv. 48, and that the *Laudes* were written before the *Bucolica*. A. G. Amatucci, *Qualche osservazione sul πρὸς τοὺς νέους δι' Basilio*: argues that there is a substantial difference in spirit between the literary ideals of Greek and Latin Christian authors, which accounts for the fact that Greek Christian literature, apart from a brief blossoming in the fourth century, had no such lasting effects as the Christian literature of the Latin West. G. Boano, *Su Massimiano e le sue elegie*: identifies the Boethius mentioned by Maximianus with the author of the *de Consolatione*, dates the embassy of Maxim. 5. 1-3 to December 546, discusses the relationship of Maximianus to his predecessors and to the *Iohannes* of Corippus, and adds notes on the text of certain passages in Maximianus. S. Accame, *Elatea e la nuova epigrafe di Stinfalo*: gives a new text of the inscription from Kionia first published by M. Mitsos (*R.É.G.* lix-lx, 1946-7, 150-74) which records a decree of Elatea in favour of Stymphalus, and argues that the Elateans were expelled from their homes by the Romans in 198 B.C. and that their return in 191/0 was followed by the passing of the decree recorded in this inscription.

SYMBOLAE OSLOENSES

FASC. XXVII: 1949.

G. Rudberg, *Zur geistigen Kultur Gross-Griechenlands*: seeks traces of South-Italian landscape and a distinctive South-Italian spirit in Greek poetry and philosophy. E. Skard, 'Ὠφελεῖν τὸν κοινὸν βίον':

shows that the use of *ὀφελείν* and *ὀφέλημα* in Aeschylus *P.V.* is due to the influence of sophistic theories on the origin of civilization; the ideas expressed by these words appear in 'sophistic' writings throughout the classical period. L. Radermacher, *Anfänge der Charakterkunde bei den Griechen*: from Corax and Tisias onwards 'arguments from probability' included those based on the character of the accused person; these character-studies influenced tragedy, comedy, and Theophrastus. A. Wilhelm, *Διάφορα*: six notes including comments on the *Paean* of Isyllus, tyrant-law at Ilium, and a passage of Plutarch's *συμποσιακά προβλήματα*. A. Wilhelm, *Zu Semonides von Amorgos*: notes on Radermacher's translation of the poem on women (*Weinen und Lachen*, Wien, 1947, pp.

156 ff.). E. Skard, *Bemerkungen zu den Asterios-Texten*: notes towards an edition of the works of Asterius (cf. xx, pp. 86 ff.; xxv, pp. 54 ff.). J. S. T. Hanssen, *Theodorici Monachus and European Literature*: discusses the models and sources of this twelfth-century historian of the ancient Norwegian kings. J. L. Tondriaux, *Romains de la République assimilés à des divinités*: notes fifteen possible cases, including M. Antonius (identified in Egypt with Dionysus and Osiris), J. Caesar (possibly with Jupiter and certainly with Ra), Cn. Pompeius (Bacchus), Sext. Pompeius (Neptune). F. M. Heichelheim, *Modern Forgeries in the Mildenhall Treasure?*: The Neptune Dish and two platters of identical technique are later than A.D. 400 and probably 'very modern'. S. Eitrem, *Varia*.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections are not included unless they are also published separately.

- Aherne* (C. M.) Valerio of Bierzo: an Ascetic of the late Visigothic Period. (Studies in Mediaeval History, N.S., vol. xi.) Pp. x+211. Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1949. Paper.
- André* (J.) La vie et l'œuvre d'Asinius Pollion. (Études et Commentaires, VIII.) Pp. 140. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949. Paper.
- Bithrey* (J.) P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber I. Edited with Introduction, Notes and Vocabulary. Pp. xlvii+173. Dublin: Brown & Nolan, 1948. Boards, 2s. 9d.
- Boas* (F. S.) Queen Elizabeth in Drama and Related Studies. Pp. 212. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Bolhuis* (A.) Vergilius' Vierde Eclogia in de Oratio Constantini ad Sanctorum Coetum. Pp. 86. Ermelo: Drukkerij v.h. P. Bolhuis, 1950. Paper.
- Bonner* (C.) Studies in Magical Amulets chiefly Graeco-Egyptian. Pp. xxiv+334; 25 plates. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1950. Cloth, \$12.50.
- Bourbérès* (K. I.) Πλάτων καὶ Ἀθήναι. Pp. 237. Athens: privately printed, 1940. Paper.
- Bourboulis* (P. P.) Apollo Delphinios. (Λαογραφία, Δελτίον τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς Λαογραφικῆς Ἑταιρείας, παράρτημα 5.) Pp. 73. Thessalonica: 1949. Paper.
- Brellich* (A.) Vesta. (Albae Vigiliae, VII.) Pp. 120. Zürich: Rhein-Verlag, 1949. Paper, 9.50 Sw. fr.
- Broadbent* (H.) The Rising of the Gauls. A Latin Course. Pp. ix+90. London: Murray, 1950. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Brown* (T. S.) Onesicritus. A Study in Hellenistic Historiography. Pp. ix+196. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press (London: Cambridge University Press), 1950. Cloth, 3s.
- Brown* (W. H.) Lucretius on the Nature of Things translated. Pp. xxi+262. New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press, 1950. Cloth, \$5.
- Buschor* (E.) Mausollus und Alexander. Pp. 55: 65 ill. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 8.50.
- Campbell* (A. Y.) Euripides, Helena. Edited with commentary and general remarks. Pp. xviii+172. Liverpool: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Cornford* (F. M.) The Unwritten Philosophy and other essays. Edited with an introductory memoir by W. K. C. Guthrie. Pp. xx+139. Cambridge: University Press, 1950. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Delz* (J.) Lukians Kenntnis der athenischen Antiquitäten. Pp. viii+194. Freiburg: Paulusdruckerei, 1950. Paper.
- Diehl* (E.) Anthologia Lyrica Graeca. Editio tertia. Fasc. 1. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubneriana.) Pp. 144. Leipzig: Teubner, 1949. Cloth and boards, \$2.40.
- Ernout* (A.) Les adjectifs latins en *-osus* et en *-ulentus*. (Société de Linguistique de Paris, Collection Linguistique, LIV.) Pp. 119. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949. Paper.
- Ferrero* (L.) Poetica Nuova in Lucrezio. (Biblioteca di Cultura, 31.) Pp. viii+193. Florence: La Nuova Italia, 1949. Paper, L. 550.
- Freeman* (K.) Greek City-States. Pp. 286: 9 maps. London: Macdonald, 1950. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Gitti* (A.) Mythos. La tradizione preistoriografica della Grecia. Prolegomeni allo studio delle origini greche. (Studi Baresi di Storia e di Filologia, Vol. I.) Pp. xx+275. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1949. Paper, L. 1400.
- Gould* (H. E.) and *Whiteley* (J. L.) Cato to St. Jerome. Selections from the first 600 years of Latin Prose. Pp. xvii+182; ill. London: Macmillan, 1950. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Graves* (R.) Apuleius: The Golden Ass. A new translation. Pp. 298. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1950. Paper, 1s. 6d. net.
- Guthrie* (W. K. C.) The Greek Philosophers from Thales to Aristotle. Pp. 168. London: Methuen, 1950. Cloth, 5s. net.

- Hoffmann* (E.) *Platon*. Pp. 222. Zürich: Artemis-Verlag, 1950. Cloth.
- Jucker* (H.) *Vom Verhältnis der Römer zur bildenden Kunst der Griechen*. Pp. 185. Frankfurt: Klostermann, 1950. Paper, DM. 12.50.
- Kähler* (H.) *Wandlungen der antiken Form*. Pp. 80; 52 plates. Munich: Münchner Verlag, 1950. Cloth, DM. 18.
- Klotz* (A.) *M. Tullius Cicero*. Fasc. 13: *In Verrem Act. Secundae Libri IV, V. Iterum recognovit A.K. (Bibl. Scr. Graec. et Rom. Teubneriana.)* Pp. 351-528. Leipzig: Teubner, 1949. Cloth and boards, \$2.15.
- Landmann* (M.) *Elenktik und Maieutik. Drei Abhandlungen zur antiken Psychologie*. Pp. 141. Bonn: Bouvier, 1950. Paper, DM. 6.
- Lejeune* (M.) *La Posición del Latín en el Dominio Indoeuropeo*. Traducción y Prólogo de C. A. R. March. (Universidad de Buenos Aires, Facultad de Filosofía y Letras, Instituto de Filología, Sección Clásica, Ser. B, Vol. III.) Pp. xi+63. Buenos Aires: Coni, 1949. Paper.
- McDermott* (W. C.) *Gregory of Tours: Selections from the Minor Works*. (Translations and Reprints from the Original Sources of History, Third Series, vol. iv.) Pp. xi+109. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 20s. net.
- Manni* (E.) *Per la Storia dei Municipii fino alla Guerra Sociale*. (Studi Pubblicati dall' Istituto Italiano per la Storia Antica, V.) Pp. viii+260. Rome: Signorelli, 1947. Paper, L. 1000.
- Misch* (G.) *Geschichte der Autobiographie*. Dritte stark vermehrte Auflage. Erster Band: *Das Altertum*. Erste Hälfte. Pp. xv+354. Bern: Francke, 1949. Paper, 15.50 Sw. fr.
- Moricca* (H.) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistularum ad Familiares libri sedecim. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.) Pars prior (libri i-viii): pp. lxxii+314. Pars altera (libri ix-xvi): pp. 315-717*. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 1200, 1300.
- Murray* (G.) *Aristophanes: The Birds*. Translated into English verse with Introduction and Notes. Pp. 183. London: Allen & Unwin, 1950. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Nelson* (L.) *Socratic Method and Critical Philosophy*. Selected Essays. Pp. xxii+211. New Haven: Yale University Press (London: Oxford University Press), 1949. Cloth, 30s. net.
- Nilsson* (M. P.) *The Minoan-Mycenaean Religion and its Survival in Greek Religion*. Second, revised edition. (Skrifter utgivna av K. Humanistika Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund, IX.) Pp. xxiv+656; 208 figs. Lund: Gleerup, 1950. Paper, kr. 50.
- Nuchelmans* (G. R. F. M.) *Studien über Φιλόλογος, Φιλολογία und Φιλολογεῖν*. Pp. vii+93. Zwolle: Tjeenk Willink, 1950. Paper.
- Otto* (W.) and *Herbig* (R.) *Handbuch der Archäologie*. Vierte Lieferung. (Müllers Handbuch VI. ii. 1.) Pp. xxiii+402; 56 plates. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 45.
- Pellegrino* (M.) *M. Minuci Felici Octavius. (Corpus Scriptorum Latinorum Paravianum.)* Pp. xxvi+62. Turin: Paravia, 1950. Paper, L. 400.
- Peuples et Civilisations: Histoire Générale. I. Les Premières Civilisations*. Par P. Jonquet, J. Vandier, G. Contenau, E. Dhorme, A. Aymard, F. Chapouthier, R. Grousset. Pp. xi+705; 3 maps. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France, 1950. Paper, 1200 fr.
- Pöschl* (V.) *Die Dichtkunst Virgils: Bild und Symbol in der Äneis*. Pp. 288. Vienna: Margarete Friedrich Rohrer, 1950. Cloth, \$2.50.
- Raeder* (H.) *Platoniske Studier*. (Kgl. Danske Videnskabernes Selskab, Filosofiske Medd., II. 5.) Pp. 29. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1950. Paper, kr. 2.
- Richler* (G. M. A.) *Archaic Greek Art*. Pp. xxv+226; 337 figs. on plates. New York and London: Oxford University Press, 1949. Cloth, 63s. net.
- Rieu* (E. V.) *Homer: The Iliad. A new translation*. (The Penguin Classics.) Pp. 469. West Drayton: Penguin Books, 1950. Paper, 2s. 6d. net.
- Roussel* (L.) *Pan! Sur l'Ion de Platon*. Pp. 120. Paris: Klincksieck, 1949. Paper, 240 fr.
- Schachermeyr* (F.) *Alexander der Grosse*. Pp. 535; 15 plates, 2 maps. Graz: Pustet, 1949. Cloth, \$1.10.
- Schmid* (W.) *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*. Erster Teil, fünfter Band: *Die griechische Literatur zur Zeit der attischen Hegemonie nach dem Eingreifen der Sophistik*. Zweite Hälfte, zweiter Abschnitt. (Müllers Handbuch VII. i. 5. 2(2).) Pp. x+377. Munich: Beck, 1948. Paper, DM. 24.
- Schwyzler* (E.) and *Debrunner* (A.) *Griechische Grammatik*. Zweiter Band: *Syntax und syntaktische Stilistik*. (Müllers Handbuch, II. i. 2.) Pp. xxiii+714. Munich: Beck, 1950. Paper, DM. 48; cloth, DM. 54.
- Sedgwick* (W. B.) *The Cena Trimalchionis of Petronius, together with Seneca's Apocolocyntosis and a selection of Pompeian inscriptions*. Second edition. Pp. 151. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1950. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Steffen* (V.) (1) *De duobus Sapphus carminibus rediivis*. Pp. 26. (2) *De duobus Alcaei carminibus novissimis*. Pp. 30. (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, Série A, Nos. 21, 37.) Wrocław: Société des Sciences et des Lettres, 1948, 1949. Paper.
- Strzelecki* (L.) (1) *De litterarum Romanarum nominibus*. (2) *De Senecae Agamemnone Euripidisque Alexandro*. Pp. 25. (Travaux de la Société des Sciences et des Lettres de Wrocław, Série A, Nos. 19, 35.) Wrocław: Société des Sciences et des Lettres, 1948, 1949. Paper.
- Symbola Coloniensis Iosepho Kroll sexagenario a.d. vi id. Nov. a. mcmil oblata*. Pp. 171. Cologne: Pick, 1950. Stiff paper, DM. 14.
- van den Daele* (A.) *Indices Pseudo-Dionysiani*. (Université de Louvain, Recueil de Travaux d'Histoire et de Philologie, 3^e série, 3^e fasc.) Pp. 154. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université, 1941.
- Vis* (J. M.) *Tertullianus' De Pallio tegen de Achtergrond van zijn overige Werken*. Pp. 155. Nijmegen: Centrale Drukkerij, 1949. Paper.

es
J.
d,
3
ce,
nd
ar-
ke
II.
co.
xv
nd
th,
la-
est
d.
co.
5;
th,
ra-
he
ch
te,
i.
8.
he
nd
II.
co.
of
lo-
p-
d:
us
ar-
la
w,
les
um
ri-
la
w,
les
d.
e:
ni.
ux
c.)
té,
de
55-